UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 000 022 333 6

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES
THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES

THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES

THE MEANS OF UNITY:

A CHARGE TO THE CLERGY

OF THE ARCHDEACONRY OF LEWES,

DELIVERED AT THE ORDINARY VISITATION IN 1842;

WITH NOTES

ESPECIALLY ON THE INSTITUTION

OF THE ANGLICAN BISHOPRIC AT JERUSALEM,

AND ON THE NEED OF AN ECCLESIASTICAL SYNOD.

BY JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A.

LONDON:
JOHN WILLIAM PARKER, WEST STRAND:
SOLD BY MACMILLAN, CAMBRIDGE.

1847.

SOLD BY ORDER
OF THE COMMITTEE

LONDON:
Printed by S. & J. BENTLEY, WILSON, and FLEY,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

Stack
Annex
5
041
788

TO THE CLERGY

OF THE ARCHDEACONRY OF LEWES

THIS CHARGE,

PUBLISHT AT THEIR REQUEST,

IS DEDICATED.

2015305

ADVERTISEMENT.

The printing of this Charge has been deferred so long, that I meant to combine it in the same Volume with those which have been delivered at the subsequent Visitations. But as it is strongly rumoured that the Parliament is shortly to be dissolved, and that the new Parliament, which will be attended by the meeting of Convocation, will be convened before the end of the summer, I have thought it advisable that this Charge, in the Notes to which I have been led to speak at some length on the want of an Ecclesiastical Synod,—a question which must soon become of immediate interest,—should be publisht by itself without further delay.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

CHARGE: The Means of Unity 3

NOTE A: On Impartiality as a principle of Ecclesiastical History, with reference to Milner, and to a Remark in Mr Newman's *Essay on Development* . 47

NOTE B: Extract from Bernard on Unity in Diversity . 55

NOTE C: On the slanderous Character of our Religious Literature 58

NOTE D: Extract from Coleridge on the differences between good men 61

NOTE E: Number of Illegitimate Births in the Archdeaconry, with reference to the operation of the New Poor-law 61

NOTE F: On the means of supporting our Diocesan Training Schools 65

NOTE G: On the Reports of the Missionary Societies, and the contributions to them 66

NOTE H: On the Jerusalem Bishopric 67

Project of the King of Prussia 68

Acceptance of it by our Prelates 74

Answer to Mr Hope's objection that it was incompatible with our Canons 77

Purpose of the Canons 78

Relation between our Church and the forein Protestants 79

Position of our Bishop at Jerusalem 83

Objections answered by Mr Hope 89

Objections on grounds of Principle answered . . . 90

PAGE

NOTE H: *continued*,
Dread of coming into contact with Heretics . . 91
Anti-protestant objections answered . . . 93
English Church and Nation Protestant . . . 94
Dr Pusey's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury 96
His attack on the Lutheran Church . . . 97
Exaggerated importance attacht to forms . . 98
Rightfulness of diversity in forms and usages . . 99
Antiquity of the practice of standing in prayer and at the Eucharist 103
Dr Pusey's misrepresentation of the Lutheran view of the Unity of the Church 106
Answer to his other charges against the Lutheran Church 115
Mr Newman's condemnation of the Jerusalem Bishopric 117
Threats of leaving the Church 118
NOTE I: Address from the Clergy of the Archdeaconry to the King of Prussia, with the King's answer . 122
NOTE J: Opinions in favour of the revival of Convocation . 124
Reply to objections from the dangers of the time . 131
From the constitution of the Convocation 135
Proper constitution of an Ecclesiastical Synod . 138
Evidence afforded by the Council of Jerusalem according to the account in Acts xv. . . . 139
Evidence to be drawn from Cyprian's Letters . 145
Gradual exclusion of the Laity 148
Necessity that the Laity should bear part in an Ecclesiastical Synod 153
Meeting of Convocation preparatory thereto . . 160
Answer to objections 161
NOTE K: On the revival of Rural Chapters 162

THE MEANS OF UNITY:

A CHARGE TO THE CLERGY

OF THE ARCHDEACONRY OF LEWES,

DELIVERED AT THE ORDINARY VISITATION IN 1842.

THE MEANS OF UNITY.

My Reverend Brethren,

When I last addrest you from this chair, I did not anticipate that I should so soon have to stand here before you again. I hoped and trusted that this year you would at length have had the benefit of an exhortation and admonition coming to you with the sanction of episcopal authority, and that I myself should have been among the hearers and learners, instead of occupying the more arduous and less welcome post of a speaker and teacher. But through the peculiar dispensation with which it has pleased God to visit our Diocese, this expectation has been baffled. It is but a little more than two years since I was raised by the kindness of Bishop Otter to the office which places me in this position amongst you; and during those two years two Bishops of this Diocese have been laid in their graves. Bishop Otter just lived long enough to win the love of his spiritual children, to shew us what a blessed thing it is when a faithful and loving servant of Christ is set on high as a father and ruler in the Church, to lay the foundations of the institutions which in the present state of England are the most needed for the strengthening and spreading of Christ's Kingdom, and, by a special and inestimable blessing, to draw our hearts together, and awaken a longing after union amongst us, at a time

when party-spirit has elsewhere been increasing so deplorably in violence and bitterness, and when it has almost seemed as though holiness and godliness were become stumblingblocks and provocatives of contention and division. His successor on the other hand was taken away before we had time to become acquainted with him. Thus we are left again this fourth year without the advantage of an episcopal Visitation, and that too at a time when the dogmatical vehemence with which contradictory opinions are asserted by the one party as the sole truth, and are branded by the other as heretical and antichristian, renders it more than ordinarily desirable that calm Wisdom should interpose her voice to moderate the excesses of partisanship and of opposition, and when, through this and other causes, every expression of episcopal judgement has acquired an unusual weight and importance; just as it is in the stress of the battle that the superintending and directing eye of the general becomes of the highest moment. On account of this, in addition to other reasons, I regret that, while the Clergy in other Dioceses are receiving instructions from their spiritual guides as to the manner in which it behoves them to judge and act in the present critical state of our Church, we should be left year after year without this authoritative counsel, and that, when a centre of unity is so much needed in every portion of the Church, and when all are becoming awakened to this want, we, after having been allowed for a short space to possess it, and thus to learn how great a blessing it may be, should thus in a manner be almost deprived of it. For such a bond of union as will constrain a collective body, with the ordinary varieties of temper

and opinion, to act cordially and vigorously together, is hardly to be found except in a strong personal attachment to an acknowledged legitimate chief, when esteem and affection for the individual enliven our reverence for the office: but this combination of feelings cannot well exist, until time has nurtured them and trained them up together. The very expressions by which we are wont to designate the relation between the Clergy of a Diocese and their Bishop, the name of father, which we give to him, and that of children, which we take to ourselves, imply that it is not a relation of sudden growth, but that habit and familiar intercourse must nourish and strengthen it. There are certain cases indeed, in which the paternal relation may arise out of a single act, as when the Apostles went from city to city, founding Church after Church, evermore begetting new spiritual children through the power of the Holy Ghost overshadowing them: yet even in the history of the apostolic age we find something especially beautiful and blessed in the yearlong relation between the Church of Ephesus and the beloved disciple of the Lord. In the ordinary condition of the Church, more particularly when the familiar intercourse between the Bishops and their Clergy is checkt by so many lamentable hindrances as nowadays in England, it would seem almost unavoidable that a considerable period must elapse, before a strong mutual attachment can be formed between them. Hence, as well as for divers other reasons, we are bound to acknowledge that a great and precious benefit was conferred upon our Church a few years ago, in the measure which, by equalizing the revenues of the several sees, was

designed to make translations much rarer, and thus to prolong the family relation between the Clergy in each Diocese and their father. May we not hope that ere long another important step will be taken to render Episcopacy still more a reality, by the multiplication of sees? so that every Bishop may be familiarly known to every clergyman, nay, in every parish, in his Diocese, and thus, instead of being in the minds of most persons little else than a name, may be honoured and loved as truly the overseer and chief shepherd of his people.

Among the visions which in these days of change and promise we are encouraged to form for the strengthening of our Church, this may perhaps be one of the dimmest and most remote; but every lover of our Church should earnestly desire its fulfilment. Hence, though this may not be precisely the time and place for speaking of such visions, I have been induced to allude to it by the recollection of the long period during which in this Diocese a Bishop has scarcely been seen amongst us. This thought reminded me, how, even at best, in the present state of our Church, the number of officers in our spiritual army bears no sort of proportion to that of the troops; and how, owing to this cause, many of the most beneficial influences, which would proceed from a wise and loving father, are now scantily exercised. Let us hope that the new life, which has been manifesting itself of late years in our Church, morbidly, it may be, often, and feverishly, but at all events with an energy to which we had not recently been accustomed, will in time be enabled, through God's blessing, to supply this, along with many other things, which for the present we must note to be wanting. To this end

let us all and each endeavour to make the best use of those faculties and powers which we have already, in the assurance that such is ever the most effectual mode of obtaining that which we have not.

In these sentences I have again ventured, as I did in both my former Charges, to express myself hopefully on the prospects of our Church. For, when I consider the various indubitable marks of an increase of activity and zeal in the great body of her ministers, and the many which seem to betoken an increase of holiness,— when I call to mind too how large a number of our lay brethren have been aroused to a livelier conviction of their membership in the body of Christ, — even after making every allowance for the evanescent effects of novelty and of fashion, and for the admixture of merely imaginative and other superficial impulses, — I cannot but cherish a hope that the Spirit of God is indeed stirring the heart of our Church, and that she is about to rise out of her long period of weakness and torpour into a higher power and glory. Yet no one can have lived in England during the last five years, least of all during the last fifteen months, without hearing piteous lamentations from opposite quarters on the condition of the Church, and dismal prognostications of the evils which threaten her. A change has indeed taken place latterly in the elements and objects of our alarm. Some years back it was thought that the Church would be assailed and injured by the State; the governing party in which was then supposed to entertain no friendly feelings toward her: our fears then were rather turned to the enemies who were attacking us from without. At present the foreboders of evil anticipate it rather from the

enemies who are conceived to be undermining the Church within. To this controversy on former occasions I have only just alluded: but its daily increasing diffusion, and its increast violence, I might almost say fierceness, during the last fifteen months, forbid my passing over it today, lest I should be accused of disserting on the history of Rome during her fourth century, without touching on the feuds between the patricians and plebeians. Yet the time and place preclude my attempting to discuss the various questions of doctrine and discipline, which have been so much agitated of late: still more do they bar my touching on the painful personal matters which have been mixt up with them. The few remarks I propose to make are of a different tendency. I should wish not to condemn either of the two contending parties utterly, nor to hold up either as being in exclusive possession of the truth; for this is the great errour and sin of both parties, that each of them does utterly condemn its opponents, and maintain that itself is in the exclusive possession of the truth. Thus it has ever been, wherever parties have prevailed, whether in the Church, or,—as the experience of every one of you will bear witness,—in the State, whether in philosophy or in literature: each party has ever asserted with sturdy selfcomplacency that it is in a land of Goshen, where it has the brightness of perfect daylight, and that its adversaries are lying under a heavy load of Egyptian darkness. This delusion is bred by the fumes of our selfconceit, and fanned by all our malignant passions, until by it the light, which we might otherwise have enjoyed, is itself turned into darkness. Our narrow and stiffneckt understandings will

not believe that there can be any forms of truth, except that which we ourselves have recognized. Though the history of our own minds ought to teach us the contrary, inasmuch as our horizon is perpetually changing, we insist that whatever happens to be our horizon at the moment is the one horizon of the universe. Although the whole history of the world, above all that of the Church, is an ever reiterated declaration that the riches of truth are infinite and of infinite variety, and that no human mind has ever been able to grasp more than a small portion of them, we can hardly be withheld from pronouncing, at the selfsame moment, that the wisdom of all former ages has been partial and bounded, and that our own is complete and unbounded.

Now a slight survey of the history of the Church might convince us that the very differences by which our own Church in these days has been so grievously divided and distracted, have existed in all ages of her course, — coming forward indeed more prominently at one time, less prominently at another, and with an alternating predominance in the body of her members,— and that they may even be traced back to the Apostolic age. Nor will it surprise any person acquainted with the attempts made so repeatedly to devise a mode of reconciling the statements of St Paul and St James on the very doctrine, which now, as in a certain sense almost throughout, has been the chief topic of contention, the doctrine of Justification, if I venture to say that the germs of the difference are to be found in the Apostolic Canon itself; only that the Apostles were preserved by their Heavenly Teacher from those

excesses in their statements of doctrine, into which the pride and presumption of human nature are ever running. In no one, except Him who was the perfect Wisdom of God, did all truth become incarnate: and though the promise of the Spirit was given to the Apostles, and in them to the Church, with the assurance that He should lead them to the whole truth, this promise was only to be fulfilled collectively in the whole Church, not in any one individual. Every living member of Christ is to have a portion of truth breathed into him, sufficient to form a ground of union with the rest of the body; but no member, except the Head, is to have all. Moreover every member is to recognize those portions of truth, those particles of spiritual life, wherewith the other members are animated, and not to reject them as alien from Christ, because they are different from his own. The eye is not to demand that the whole body shall be eye; nor the ear, that the whole shall be ear. These are propositions, the truth of which, when they are stated thus generally, none of us will dispute: and yet it is marvellous how perpetually we are almost all sinning against them, in thought, in feeling, and in action. For there is a kind of fallacy inherent in our very constitution. The eye cannot conceive that there is anything visible, except what it sees itself; nor can the ear conceive that there is anything to be heard, except what it hears itself; still less can the eye see sounds, or the ear hear sights: nor again can the understanding well conceive that there is any knowledge to be understood, except what it understands itself. Thus each of our faculties, according to the egotistical perversion of our nature, is fond of

seating itself on the throne of judgement, and pronouncing sentence against everything with which it is not familiar: and the constraining power of experience and moral discipline are needed, before we become ready to allow that there are worlds of visible things beyond the range of our eyes, and innumerable sounds beyond the range of our ears, and infinite masses of knowledge beyond the range of our understandings. Nor is this a lesson which we can learn at once, or ever wholly: we need to have it continually imprest upon us anew, so that it may not fade away from our consciousness, but may be a living monitor to guide our minds, and temper our hearts.

When we look back with any attention and reflexion on the history of the Church, it may seem that one of the first convictions which must force itself upon us, must be, that in the moral and spiritual, no less than in the natural world, the forms of life are indefinitely various; and that, as in the Ark, by which the remnants of a former race were preserved from the universal destruction, all forms of natural life were congregated, so are all the modes and forms of spiritual life gathered in the Church of that Lord, who came to rescue mankind from the all-destroying deluge of sin. Under all these forms however, one and the same Spirit manifests Himself; and by Him are they incorporated into the one body of Christ. This ought to be the result of such a survey; and yet even among the historians of the Church, whose researches and speculations ought to render them familiar with this spectacle, how few have been really able to discern and recognize any other forms and modes of spiritual life, than those to which their

own habitual prepossessions have attacht them! Thus, instead of learning from history to emancipate themselves from their narrow clinging prejudices, they carry those prejudices along, and distort history by means of them (A).

Even in the college of Apostles, as I have remarkt, a diversity is observable, owing in part to their natural character and temper, in part to their habits of thought. For the work of the Spirit, as is plainly seen both in them, and in the Prophets under the prior dispensation, and as has been manifested abundantly since in the chief saints and teachers of the Church, is not to blunt the edge, and round the points of individual character, not to cast all men into the same mould, and to shape them all after the same pattern, but to bring out and purify and perfect the peculiar qualities and gifts of each. Hence even in the inspired writings which make up the Canon of the New Testament, we find that certain portions of the same divine truth were proclaimed more distinctly and cordially by one writer, other portions by another. Among the wisest and holiest saints, who were all animated by the same living faith in the Divine Father, reconciled to us by the Atonement of His Son, and sending His Spirit into our hearts, from whom alone all good must come, there have still been great diversities of doctrine and opinion, partly from circumstances of time, place, education, association, partly from the very constitution of their minds, better fitted for the reception and assimilation of some portions of the truth than of others. There have been diversities from age to age, as fresh portions of the truth have come within our intellectual vision. There have been diversities and differences among the wisest and best

men of the same age, not necessarily implying any positive errour, but merely the imperfection and finiteness of their faculties. Moreover, as the natural consequence of this imperfection, the errours which have prevailed, where the holders of them were sincere and faithful, have mostly been of two kinds; errours of excess, the result of pushing a doctrine too far, from losing sight of the counterbalancing or complementary doctrines; and errours of denial, with regard to such doctrines as did not seem easily reconcilable with those which were deemed of paramount importance. Into these two classes of errours even good men are very apt to fall. They are apt to exaggerate the importance of those truths which have struck the most forcibly on their own hearts and understandings, and which to them may be everything they need, but which may not come home with equal power to others, in different circumstances, and with differently constituted organs of perception; and they are too ready to deny the importance of those truths, which may never have been brought distinctly and strongly before them. Yet here again their own experience ought to teach them, that, amid the infinite riches of truth stored up for mankind in the Scriptures, there are portions adapted, as it were, for every emergency, for every peculiar state of heart or mind,—that there are truths to which at one time they have found no response in themselves, but which at other times overflow with refreshment and comfort. Surely then, if this be the case perpetually with ourselves, we should acknowledge that this may, nay, that it must be so with others: nor should we require that all men should be equally

imprest with those truths, which seem at the moment the most impressive to us.

In looking back, I say, through the history of the Church, we find that there have always been two main streams of theological doctrine, proceeding, like the rivers which issued out of Paradise, from the same heavenly source, but flowing down from that source, the one through the channel of St Paul, the other through that of St James; one in their origin, as the doctrine of St Paul is with that of St James, and perfectly consistent with each other, but, when viewed at a distance from their source, often seeming to run in contrary directions, more especially after men begin to embank and lock up the living waters, and to turn them into artificial courses. Nor do we see these differences merely among individuals, but also at times characterizing distinct branches of the Church. Thus a different tone of doctrine prevailed in the Eastern Church, from that which since the time of Ambrose and Augustin became predominant in the Western. Yet who, except a narrowminded and ignorant bigot, will deny that Athanasius and Basil and Chrysostom were masters in Christian doctrine, although certain portions of the truth were not brought out so distinctly before their minds, as before that of Augustin. Nor again will any wise and candid man question that Anselm, and Bernard, and Aquinas, and the other great divines of the middle ages, were animated by the Spirit of truth, although the mind of their generation was not fully awakened to a consciousness of certain inestimable truths, which were never duly recognized, after the Apostolic age, until Luther was ordained to inscribe them on the holy banner of the

Reformation. I am not here presuming to measure the relative value and importance of the several portions of divine truth. Some parts, I readily acknowledge, may be far more important, both in themselves, and with regard to their moral efficacy, than others; even as in any organic structure some members are more indispensable than others, for the chief vital functions, and for life itself. At the same time it behoves us to bear in mind that, if the partial notions of Christian truth, which were current in the middle ages, opened a way for numberless abuses and corruptions, the very doctrine of justification by faith was perverted in Luther's own days, as it had been in St Paul's, and has been ever since, into the wildest extravagances of Antinomianism. The proposition I am anxious to urge is, that where we see such evidence of the presence of the Spirit of Christ, as is afforded by Christian zeal and holiness and self-denial and love, we are not warranted in questioning the presence of that Spirit, on the strength of certain doctrinal propositions which do not seem to fit exactly into our own theological system. On the contrary it would rather beseem us to enquire whether this may not arise from the narrowness or incompleteness of that system itself. We hear the charge of heresy in these days bandied to and fro, as if it were a light matter. Even grave and thoughtful men, whose own sufferings from evil report ought to have taught them humility and charity, will audaciously take upon themselves to affix this hateful name to the wisest and holiest champions of the faith. Let us, my brethren, abstain from such unchristian presumption. Let us endeavour to keep our own faith, and our own doctrine, straight before

God: and let us leave the condemnation of our brethren, if indeed they are to be condemned, for erroneous teaching to those who are called to exercise judgement by their position and authority in the Church. If we meet with propositions here and there, which startle us, and seem to contradict our own convictions, let us call to mind how many texts in the Bible itself seem at first sight inconsistent with other texts, and can only be reconciled with them by the most careful examination and comparison. Above all, let us beware lest, while charging our opponents with impugning the truths declared by St Paul, we furnish ground for the recrimination, that we ourselves have not paid sufficient regard to the Catholic Epistles and the Gospels.

Considerable varieties in doctrinal views, I have been remarking, are proved by the history of the Church to be quite compatible with the presence of the Spirit of Truth in the soul. I might exemplify this by comparing the principal Monastic orders together, or the Mystics with the Schoolmen, or the Jansenists in later ages with the ordinary teaching of the Romish Church. But it will be more to our present purpose to observe, that the Church of England, at and since the Reformation, has wisely taken special care to recognize, by the cautious and judicious manner in which her Formularies are drawn up, that there are many questions of doctrine on which her members, and even her Ministers, may allowably differ. This is the *Via Media* so much spoken of, which she desired to tread; not a *Juste Milieu*, in which opposite opinions are to neutralize each other; but a zodiacal path in which they may move on harmoniously together on each side of the equator;—not

again, as it is sometimes represented, a narrow, winding byroad, following the contortions of an individual mind, and hedged in with thorny thickets to exclude all save the few privileged engrossers of the truth; but a wide expanse, where all who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity of heart, and acknowledge the Catholic Creeds of the Church, and will pay due obedience to her ordinances, may walk side by side. Among our leading divines too, while a few, such as Hooker, Sanderson, and Field, seem to have had a like expansive intellect, able to embrace and combine opposite truths, the chief part have a strong bias on one side or the other. Yet both classes are true and lawful children of the same mother: and even though our own leanings and partialities may be to the side of Leighton and Hall and Davenant and Ussher and Donne, though we may think that they have given a clearer and fuller enunciation of what seem to us the fundamental truths in the Gospel, yet no wise man will assert that Taylor and Thorndike and Bull do not deserve to be held in honour as genuine and worthy sons of our Church. It is prettily remarkt by St Bernard, that the vesture of Christ is not only to be without seam, woven from the top throughout, but also, like the coat of him who was in so many things a type of our Lord, of divers colours, through the manifold gifts bestowed on the Church by one and the same Spirit; and again, that, as there are many mansions in our Heavenly Father's house, so are there many paths leading to those mansions (B). Now, while we are to be pressing onward along our appointed path toward the particular mansion set before us, it will only interrupt and hinder us if we try to

compell others to quit their paths, and to walk in our train.

I have been saying much, too much you may think, on this subject. But no one among you can doubt that the voice of the peacemaker, vain as it may usually prove, and loth as all parties may be to listen to it, is much needed now. In truth, whenever any fresh awakening of religious zeal sets men's hearts and minds astir, our Lord's declaration that He came, not to send peace upon earth, but a sword, is found to be still receiving its fulfilment; and too often His ministers, mistaking its meaning, fancy that they themselves are to wield the sword, instead of merely suffering from the violence with which His enemies wield it. Besides there are sundry unfortunate peculiarities in the circumstances of our times, which tend to exasperate controversies, and to make every man and woman, and almost every child, take part in them. Above all, there are religious journals, and that strange anomaly and nuisance, religious newspapers, a sort of vermin springing up in the stagnant mud of the press, which live almost by fostering and inflaming animosities. The age of patient study would seem to have wellnigh past away; and one of the curses of party-spirit has ever been, that it deadens the sense of personal responsibility, which would otherwise make an honest man feel that he ought to know what he is condemning. Not one person in a hundred, among those who speak with the greatest confidence and heat on the theological disputes of the day, will even pretend that he has attentively and candidly examined a single one of the more elaborate works, against which he is in the habit of inveying. But our favorite

magazine or newspaper supplies us every now and then with an extract, which, standing by itself, seems to offend against our views of the Gospel; while railing, with more or less of salt, more or less of venom in it, is served up daily and weekly and monthly and quarterly, as a substitute for argument (c). Now few minds are steady and well-balanced enough, not to be driven out of a right line, when such forces are continually acting upon them. Indeed my conviction of the mischief which must almost unavoidably result from the influence of a journal, cherishing and exaggerating our prepossessions, is so strong, that I have for many years found it expedient to lay down a rule for my own practice, to confine my reading mainly to those journals, the general line of opinions in which is adverse to my own. This is a prudential maxim, which I think I may safely recommend to you; for thus your reading, instead of increasing any prejudice that you may be conscious of, would rather tend to allay it, or would at all events give you an insight into the character and purport of the opinions you impugn. And surely, if one is to place oneself on the seat of judgement, one ought carefully to ascertain what the culprit has to say for himself, in what his offense really consists, before one pronounces sentence against him.

It is true, while the history of the Church shews us how widely holy men have often differed from each other in their theological notions, it also shews us, in too many instances, that their holiness has not overcome the infirmities of their nature, and that they have been over-ready to condemn and anathematize the doctrines, the truth of which they could not discern. In this respect

however, if they are held up to us, it should not be for imitation, but for grave and solemn warning. When we look back at them from our present distance, we perceive how that which was precious in them, was the Christian truth which they held in common; how that which was worthless, was the excesses and negations, which formed the ground and material of their differences. The clouds and storms have past away: the blue sky abides. This is one of the thoughts that comfort us, when we are pained by reading of the vehemence with which good and holy men have contended against one another. The great Christian philosopher of these latter times, in one of the numberless beautiful passages which gem his writings, speaks of his delight in reflecting with what joy and dearness the blessed spirits of Hammond and Baxter are now loving each other (D). Let that which is saddening in the aspect of religious controversies, and that which is soothing in the thought what love must have dawned on the combatants, when the mists of this world were swept away from before them, move us to refrain watchfully from exaggerating the errours of such of our brethren as may differ from us, to look behind the mask of their opinions, which so often are nothing more than a mask, and that too disfigured and distorted by the blows and wrenches it has received, and to rejoice in acknowledging whatsoever graces the Spirit of God may have enricht them with.

Not that I mean hereby to question the duty, which, as it is incumbent on all the members of the Church, according to the measure of their knowledge, is so especially on her ministers, of contending earnestly for the faith, for its purity, and for its integrity. Not that I

would urge you to seek peace by lax indulgence to errour, and the sacrifice, or the compromise of truth. Such peace would be false and hollow; and the loss would be far greater than the gain. If it be indeed the case, that any of the essential doctrines of Christianity have been misrepresented and perverted in the opinions which have recently gained so much vogue, it behoves us to be even more than ordinarily diligent in proclaiming and enforcing those very doctrines. For this is ever the most efficacious and the most beneficial mode of putting down an errour; not by a direct refutation, however subtile and cogent, but by setting forth the truth which it contravenes in clearer power and glory. This is the best mode, both for the person who adopts it, and for others; because it is far wholesomer to be engaged in constructive, than in destructive operations,—in the assertion of truth, which is a work of love, as well for the truth itself, as for the persons one desires to win to it, than in the exposition of falsehood, which is apt to breed harshness and bitterness and animosity and scorn; and because, even if you succeed in removing an errour from a man's mind, you render him a sorry service, unless you replace it with something that will afford nourishment to his intellect and his feelings. Still, so wayward is the course of this world, so many tangled sophistries are ever springing up across the path along which Reason would fain advance, that it is often expedient and necessary to assail errour with a direct contradiction. Thus St Paul felt himself bound to withstand St Peter to the face, in a matter involving the very question of justification, which in one way or other lies at the bottom of so many of the disputes whereby the

Church has been agitated. Thus too all the Apostles were engaged from the earliest times in contending against the teachers of false and carnal and licentious notions, even within the pale of the Church. Indeed for the wellbeing of the Church such a perpetual sifting and winnowing, in order to get rid of the chaff, is absolutely necessary. He who came to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven, bore His fan in His hand. For though a large amount of errour with regard to dogmas may exist in the understandings of individuals, and yet lie dormant in their hearts, without material detriment to their spiritual life, the same errours, if generally received and openly taught, could not be otherwise than pernicious; as we see in the Romish Church, which, notwithstanding its gross errours, has been adorned by many holy and godly men, yet in which these errours have exercised a noxious influence on the body of the people. Therefore every form of errour, with which Satan vexes and harasses the Church, is to be striven against, until it be exterminated. When we are commanded to begin by casting the beam out of our own eye, it is not with the intention that we should leave the mote sticking in our brother's eye, but in order that we may see clearly to cast that out also. Only let us ever bear in mind, that this is our aim, not to wound and lacerate our brother's eye,—not, as is the manner of some, to thrust in the mote still further, to the end that they may boast themselves against him,—but to cast it out; an operation, which in so delicate and inflammable a member should be performed with the utmost steadiness and calmness and gentleness. And if we are to do this successfully, we must endeavour in the first place to cast out all evil

and bitter and hostile feelings out of our own eyes, as such a beam would inevitably darken them, and to set about the work as a work of love. Against falsehood, wilful or careless misrepresentation, detraction, slander, as against other sins, we may warrantably use the severity of rebuke; but where the errour is of the understanding, and where the heart, in spite of it, is to all appearance pure and upright, our object surely ought not to be to confound and crush our brother in the midst of his darkness, but to deliver him, and bring him out into the clear glad light of truth.

In this way does it behove those who are qualified for doing so, to combat the errours, if there are any in our days, lifting up their heads in the Church. I have spoken throughout problematically, without taking upon myself to pronounce in this place that any particular errours are indeed prevailing. Not that I would be understood in so doing to imply that I am in a state of uncertainty as to whether this is the case or not. But, though it may be right for a person invested with episcopal authority, when addressing his spiritual children, to warn them against errours which he may deem likely to mislead them, without detailing the reasons of his apprehension, it would not beseem me to speak on so grave and solemn themes, unless I prepared the way for my sentence by such a full exposition of the subject matter, as would be very inappropriate on this occasion, were it only from the demand on your patience, which even without will be more than sufficiently taxt. All of us however, so many as deem that there are hurtful errours spreading in our Church, may do something in the way of resisting

them, and of winning back our brethren to the truth: even those may do much, who do not feel qualified for entering the lists of argumentative discussion. In the first place, we may all be more diligent and strenuous in bringing forward those truths which we think likely to be thrown into the background. Again, to the end that we may not exasperate our opponents, and confirm them in their errours, we may refrain, and should do so carefully, from all that bitterness and violence of speech, and from those sweeping condemnations of whole classes for the extravagance and folly of a few hotheaded or halfwitted zealots, which are especially common where persons are ignorant of the real nature and grounds of the controversy, and have taken no pains to clear up this ignorance, but pin their flimsy faith to one or other of those noisome journals which amuse and scare the so-called religious public.

Moreover, as union in action is ever among the best ways of producing unity of feeling, we may one and all rouse ourselves, and call upon our brethren to rouse themselves, to greater energy and assiduity in those high and arduous works, which God has appointed for this age of His Church. Alas! while we are quarreling and reviling each other, the Man of Sin is gaining ground against us. Can we not unite to repell him? Would not this be a nobler and more blessed work than tearing each other to tatters? We have much to do to resist him, — much, each of us, in our own hearts,—much in our several parishes,—much in England at large,—much in every quarter of the earth. I have already detained you so long, that I must confine myself to

touching very briefly on two or three of these subjects; and I am the better able to do this, as in both my former Charges, and in the Notes subjoined to them, I have endeavoured to set forth some of the main obligations, which appear to me to be imposed on us by the present condition of our Church. In such matters it is not to be expected that each year will supply a fresh series of topics. That which was our work last year, is still our work this year, and will continue to be so, until it is accomplisht: and though the Church of late years seems in some respects to have partaken in the universal acceleration, a long time, I am afraid, will elapse, before the objects, to which I have formerly called your attention, will be thoroughly effected.

At all events it will undoubtedly be long before we can establish anything like a sound system of moral discipline in our parishes. On this question I will add nothing today to my previous observations, except by recommending it again to your gravest and most earnest consideration, both privately, and when you assemble in chapter. I have received additional assurances that the measures suggested in the Notes on my last Charge have been attended with beneficial results. Penally they may be deemed feeble; but they are not without effect in awakening and fostering, what we so much desire and need, the feeling of shame in the bosoms of our women. As to the course which it may be expedient to adopt toward hardened offenders, it would perhaps be premature at this moment to say anything. I trust that, ere many years have past by, our Ecclesiastical Courts will be rendered more efficient for this

purpose also. But as a Bill is about to be brought before the Legislature, to regulate the jurisdiction of these Courts, as nothing is yet known concerning the provisions of this Bill, and as at this period of the Session it will scarcely be introduced with any intention of its becoming law this year, it will be better to suspend our remarks on this subject till we are possest of further information.

With regard to the Circular however, which I addrest to you last summer, requesting you to supply me with a statement of the number of illegitimate births in your parishes, during each of the last twelve years, taking this period in order that we might have six years anterior, and six subsequent to the introduction of the new Poorlaw, in the hope of getting some sort of means for judging what the operation of that law in this respect has actually been, you will doubtless be anxious to learn the result. From a few parishes, owing probably to some accident, no returns have been sent to me. But a tabular survey of those which I have received enables me to form a tolerably accurate estimate of the result which would have been obtained from the whole Archdeaconry; and when I first cast my eyes along that table, a ghastly sight it was. Yet, although it exhibited a fearful increase of above twenty per cent, in the number of illegitimate children baptized since the year 1834, I will not take upon me to assert that this is a decisive proof that the clauses of the Poorlaw bearing on this matter are on the whole injurious. Even if the result had been the other way, exhibiting a considerable diminution, I should have hesitated about allowing that this was attributable

solely, or even mainly, to the new Poorlaw. For some beneficial effects, in this respect also, might surely be expected from improvements in our parochial education, and from the increast activity of our Clergy. But it was truly dismal to see, that, notwithstanding these counteracting causes, the change had been so greatly for the worse; and when, on casting up the numbers, I found that above eleven hundred children have been born out of wedlock during the last six years in the Archdeaconry, the startling spectacle did indeed convince me that we have ample work for far greater strength than we are at present able to muster in fighting against the Man of Sin in our parishes (E). In one or two parishes only has any considerable diminution taken place; and when I tried in one case to ascertain the cause, the improvement seemed to have arisen from the conscientious exertions of the Minister, who, in reply to my enquiry as to the means he had used, said, he was not conscious of any other, than fervent, constant, and, he hoped, faithful prayer, bold, uncompromising preaching, and exhortation in private to matrons and mothers of families with regard to the younger women. Through God's blessing vouchsafed to these means, the number of illegitimate children baptized in his parish has been reduced, from nineteen in the first six years, to five in the last six; and I venture to recommend the same course to you all, which, if you follow it perseveringly, God will assuredly bless, so that, with His grace, you may hope to lessen the prevalence of this terrible sin among our people.

This too is a part of England, which in many respects may be deemed peculiarly favoured. For in our county

we have none of those hotbeds of sin, which Mammon has been heaping up so assiduously during the last half century. But when we cast our eyes over some parts of England, does it not indeed seem as if the whole head were sick, and the whole heart faint? as though from the sole of the foot to the head there were nothing but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores? All of you must have read some accounts of those horrours, of those disgraces to human nature, which have recently been brought to light by the energy and perseverance of the noble protector and champion of the poor. You will have read stories of the abominations which in this nineteenth century of Christianity are habitually perpetrated in our coal-mines; abominations, the like of which have scarcely been found among the most savage tribes, or the most corrupt nations of Heathendom. And this is only a portion of the vice and misery, of the degradation, moral and physical, on which the commercial wealth of England rests. Here then, my brethren, is work for us. If we have any strength to spare, beyond what we need for the culture of our own parishes, and if we must spend it in fighting,—I would not dissuade you from doing so: let us do so by all means; let us fight boldly and continually, with the arms which God has placed in our hands: only, instead of fighting against each other, let us fight against Sin; let us fight against Belial; let us fight against Mammon; let us fight against Ashtaroth; let us help Lord Ashley in his heroic and godly endeavour to deliver the children of England from the moral desolation, to which the Spirit of Commerce is dooming them. It is a painful thought, that, although our Church is so intimately united to the State, and although her Ministers

ought to have deemed it their great political task to prompt and urge the State to the fulfilment of its moral duties, and to rouse it to noble and generous enterprises in the cause of humanity, we have wofully neglected this our task for the last hundred and fifty years. We have been quarreling interminably with each other, and quarreling in all manner of warfare with the Dissenters, instead of calling upon the nation to serve God, and to cast away its idolatrous abominations, and to consecrate its mighty powers to the holy work of spreading the Kingdom of Christ through the whole length and breadth of that enormous empire over which the Soverein of England bears sway. Had we been more diligent in this work, we should have had less time for quarreling, and less inclination, and fewer objects of contention. Union in action would have prevented division; and so it would do now.

Another great work, in which we may all unite, is the diffusion and improvement of education. Having said so much on this head in my former Charges, I will only again remind you that education is not a work which can be done once for all, by a single spirt of zeal, but that it requires continuous, patient, persevering exertion. A few years since, when a plan of education was brought forward by the Government, which, it was deemed, would deprive the Clergy of the superintendence of our national education, we were all on the alarm, all on the alert. We exclaimed that it was an unholy measure, that it ought not to be, and must not be; for that the Clergy alone were qualified to be the educaters of the people. That this is indeed so,—that, through our relation to our parishioners, if we fulfill our duty, and if we do not allow

sectarian prejudices to warp and cramp our minds, we are better fitted than any other persons could be to superintend the education of the children in our parishes,—and that this would be the best safeguard against the numerous temptations, which, in this age more especially, would seduce parents into caring little about any education for their children, except such as may help them to get on in this world,—I am fully persuaded. Let it not be said of us however, that our zeal in the cause of education was merely kindled by opposition, and that, when the opposition subsided, it died away. In many cases, I readily believe, this has not been the case: the activity which was then excited, has been lasting, and has even increast. But may I not ask you, my brethren, whether you all feel the same lively interest in the education of the people, the same strong practical conviction that it is the office and duty of the Clergy to watch over and direct that education, which you manifested four years ago? There is nothing invidious in such a question. On the contrary it is the universal tendency of human nature to be astir in a storm, and to flag in a calm. Therefore, when the calm has returned, we need to be frequently reminded of our former professions, and admonisht not to let our activity fall short of them. Under the impulses of that zeal, it was resolved to form a new branch of our Diocesan Association, connected with education, and to found a Training School for Masters; and this has now been followed by the establishment of a Training School for Mistresses at Brighton. About the former, I believe, there is some difference of opinion: on the desirableness of the latter all are agreed. For my own part I am convinced that both are excellent institutions, and that

our Diocese, though one of the smallest, is well able to support them both, if we awake to a right sense of the duties of our Christian calling. At the same time our undertakings are of such magnitude that they cannot be carried on without general efforts to support them. Hence, at the Meeting of the Committee of the Association in December last, the members present, without the expression of a difference, united in requesting our late Bishop to issue a Circular this year, and every year, calling upon the Clergy of the Diocese to make a collection in every parish-church in support of objects of such wide and lasting utility. And here, my brethren, I regret to say that there must be some amongst you, with whom I feel bound to remonstrate. When I lookt over the list of Collections made in compliance with the Circular of last year, I was much grieved to observe that the names of nearly eighty parishes in this Archdeaconry, about half of the whole number, were wanting. Surely, my brethren, this is not as it should be. Surely, when the Diocese has such great works in hand, and still greater, with God's blessing, for the promotion of His glory, before us,—when God is stirring up the hearts of many to make sacrifices and to practise self-denial for the promotion of these works,—surely it is not right, it is not becoming, that any parish should be deprived of the privilege of taking part in them. For this is the true light to look at the matter in. It is a privilege and a blessing, for the poor as well as the rich, for all, one with another, for the lord, for the squire, for the farmer, for the tradesman, for the mechanic, for the husbandman, to be called upon to join together in giving of that which they have received from God, for the building up of His Church in the hearts and

minds of His people. Look upon it, I beseech you, in this light. Let me not be under the necessity of thinking that you do not deem it a privilege, that you deem it a burthen, and that from that burthen you would shrink. For suppose, we view this Diocese as a portion of the Church Militant, that is now gathering her strength for the battle against ignorance and ungodliness and sin; what must be the portion of those who would lag behind, or slink away from this glorious battle? what must be the portion of those who would keep all they have to themselves, and will not spend any portion of it in the cause of God, and for the endless good of their brethren? (F).

You may think this is a string on which I harpt sufficiently last year. But I am afraid it is a string on which, if my life be prolonged, I shall have to harp year after year. For alas! in this country, which is enricht so greatly above all others by God's bounty, there are still vast multitudes who have no notion that they hold their wealth in stewardship, or that they are bound to give back any portion of it to the Giver. It is true, many munificent persons are to be found at this day in England. Liberality, through God's blessing, is increasing, is becoming less rare, and higher in kind, more self-denying and self-sacrificing. But still there are numbers who have always enough to answer every call except that of charity, the very sound of which ties up their pursestrings, and makes them fancy themselves on the verge of poverty, so that they begin exclaiming in a nervous agitation that it is quite impossible to comply with such continually repeated demands. Not however that such persons do really run much risk of

beggaring themselves: for fear of being inundated with visiters, they take care not to be at home to anybody. Numberless too as have been the bankruptcies of late years, I have not heard of one that has been occasioned by giving over much to God. The expenditure which brings ruin is offered up at very different shrines.

The next subject I have to touch on is connected with these last observations. It was resolved, as most of you must be aware, at meetings held during the last twelvemonth in several of the principal places in the Archdeaconry, that greater exertions should be made in support of the Missionary work of the Church, and that Associations in aid of it should be formed in every parish, either severally, or in union with some of the adjacent parishes. The time will not allow me to enter into those considerations pertaining to this subject, important as they are, on which I have spoken in the Notes to my last Charge. But, while I express my gratitude for the kindness with which I was received by you, wherever I went, and the satisfaction I felt at the cordial pleasure with which you hailed my invitation, and enforced it by your speeches at our meetings, I would fain ask you here again,—as this is a sort of annual account-day,—what has been done in consequence of those resolutions? Have you all made much progress in forming the Associations determined on? At all events I trust that the speakers at our meetings, who so earnestly urged the duty incumbent on all the members of our Church, to take a lively, active interest in the diffusion of the Gospel, will have strengthened and crowned their words with their example. This is a matter of the deepest and most pressing importance; and every year the magnitude of the

work increases. We have much past negligence to atone for: our long continued torpour has been a disgrace to our Church, and has been fraught with calamities to it: and so awful is the duty imposed on England, so blessed is the privilege to which she above all other nations is especially called, to labour for the extension of Christ's Kingdom, that it behoves us, my brethren, not to rest until something is effected for the furtherance of this glorious work in every parish, even in the very smallest and poorest, throughout the land. Some of you may fear that you will not be able to do much: but let not this discourage you: set to work heartily; and difficulties will smoothe themselves before you. The coward's and sluggard's lion dwindles into a mouse before the bold. Among the poor you will ever find many, whose hearts will readily open to sympathy with their brethren in the Colonies, and still more with the heathens. That the middle classes may be awakened to feel a warm interest in such things, is proved by the large sums raised by some of the Missionary Societies among the Dissenters, collections which quite shame our Church by the comparison.

Here let me introduce a remark on a point, which some may deem trifling, but which seems to me of no small moral importance. Our Saviour's command is, that, when we do our alms, we are not to let the left hand know what the right hand is doing. How scrupulously this command is complied with in the Reports of our Societies, everybody is aware. More than half the volume is often filled with lists of the subscribers, whose names and gifts are thus paraded to the world. Surely this is not a right practice for Societies which aim at such objects as the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, and the Propagation of

the Gospel, and the bringing of the heathens into the Kingdom of Christ. Bodies engaged in such works ought to be watchful over the minutest details of their conduct. And why, for what purpose, is this ostentatious peacock's tail to spread itself out at the end of our Reports? what should withhold us from docking it? from trying at least to get rid of it? Why should not each parish send up its annual contribution, in whatever way collected, in one mass, as the offering of the parish toward the Missionary work of the Church, without any mention of individual names? (G) This would bear witness to our acting as one body, instead of in insulation, and would put an end to a practice which must needs be offensive to every person of right feelings. To this plan I have only heard two objections. It is contended that the present system gains more money, many being induced to give something for the sake of seeing their names in the Reports. Hereto it would be a sufficient reply, that we must not do evil, or entice others to do evil, in order that good may come of it; if indeed money drawn from such a source can be called good. But I would deny the proposition altogether. Vanity is never liberal, never has been so, never will be so. Whatever vanity does in the way of good works, will be done at the least possible cost: for it is a niggard, barren, tumid, and empty. Meanwhile, by appealing to bad motives and fostering them, we check the growth of better principles, and dwarf, if we do not altogether crush them. The meagre and almost unvaried string of guinea-subscribers in our Reports is itself a proof that such motives are impotent to make men give largely. Call upon a man to give to the glory of God, for the Christian education of his

destitute fellow-countrymen, for the conversion of the heathens; and he may rejoice to spend and be spent for such a purpose. But if he is merely to see his name in a list of subscribers, a mite will procure him that honour. The second objection has not more force than the first, namely, that the lists are a check against malversation of the sums collected, and that they prevent suspicions, to which certain tempers would otherwise be prone. The same end might however be attained within the parish, if a quarterly or annual statement of the sums collected were drawn up by the Treasurer, and laid before the Committee. The Reports of the Societies would afterward shew that the gross amount of the monies raised in the parish for each Society had been transmitted to their destination. After what I have often said on the desirableness of inducing the Laity to take an active part in the works of the Church, it cannot be requisite for me to add here, that I should deem it advisable that the Treasurer of the Parochial Association should be a layman, wherever one qualified and willing to undertake the office can be found. Nor need I again repeat that, for the whole work of these Associations, you will mostly be able, at least after a short time, when the minds of your parishioners have been in some measure awakened on this great Christian duty, to obtain valuable aid among the Laity, especially from the female part of them. And you will be conferring a great and lasting benefit upon them, if you can lead them to take a lively and active interest in promoting the objects of your Association. They who consent to act as collectors are brought thereby into a profitable intercourse with the more religiously disposed

among the poor; and such an intercourse brings down a blessing upon both parties.

A powerful reason and motive for greater activity in this work is to be found in the wonderful manner in which God has recently blest our feeble and scanty efforts. The Church herself has taken a great spring forward through the resolution to send out Bishops to all our Colonies. The rich harvest with which the labours of some of our Missionaries have recently been rewarded, almost carries us back to the first ages of the Church, and bears witness that, in the spiritual world also, the increase may be out of all calculable proportion to the seed sown. At the same time God has shewn in the last year, that He still vouchsafes to honour those who endeavour, however imperfectly, to honour Him. For assuredly it has been a singular honour granted to our Church, that the King of Prussia should have been moved to seek her aid, in order that he might execute his godly purpose of sending a Bishop of the Reformed Church to Jerusalem. The time will not allow me to speak as I would on this glorious and blessed event: but having twice already addrest you on occasion of it, I cannot withhold the expression of my pleasure at having found such lively and almost unanimous sympathy with my own feelings among you. To me it appeared to be an event rich in blessed promise. Not to dwell on the joy, which, it seemed to me, every true son of our Church must needs feel at the thought of seeing one of her Bishops seated on the holy hill of Zion, in the city of the Saviour; not to speak of the practical benefits which may be expected from our having our missionaries and other ministers in Syria and Egypt under episcopal superintendence;

two boundless prospects seemed at once to open before our eyes, carrying them forward into distant ages. On the one hand it appeared as though we should hereby obtain the most favorable opportunities for entering into communication and connexion with the ancient Churches of the East, and might thus become the means of imparting some of those blessings to them, which have been bestowed so richly on our own Church, in a purer doctrine and ritual and a more spiritual faith. On the other hand, there was a kind of promise, that through the same event, whereby we were thus brought into intimate relations with the Church of Prussia, our Church might be enabled to aid in perfecting the discipline and constitution of the Reformed Churches on the Continent, so that the institutions which they reluctantly lost through the peculiar circumstances of their Reformation, should be restored to them by our hands. All these prospects were set before us; and the rulers of our Church blest God for them, and hailed them with delight. I am not going to enter here into the painful controversy which has since arisen. With surprise and deep regret did I first learn that any members of our Church, professing to love her and her Lord, lookt with repugnance and aversion on a measure, which was assuredly conceived and carried on, as few measures ever have been, in the pure spirit of Christian love (H). Under this conviction, although I should be very unwilling to take any step in my official capacity, which appeared likely to provoke contention, yet, when the great and good King, in whose bosom the whole plan was conceived, and who had all along shewn such exemplary generosity and disinterestedness,—leaving the whole

arrangement of the details of the measure, and the appointment of the first Bishop to the Prelates of our Church,—came to England at the invitation of our Queen, and when a considerable number of the Clergy of the Archdeaconry called upon me to prepare an address to him, I readily and gladly acceded to their request. For I felt sure that there could be very few, if any, amongst you, who partook in the above-mentioned repugnance and aversion. And this confidence was fully justified by the result. Hardly anything connected with my office has given me so much pleasure as the letters which poured in upon me from all quarters, expressing the heartiest concurrence in the proposed Address, and the liveliest joy at the events which occasioned it. A hundred and fifty-five Clergy out of about a hundred and eighty,—the whole number in the Archdeaconry,—joined in signing it; and among the few who did not, we may reasonably suppose that a considerable portion were withheld by accidental causes, or by slight scruples about points of form, far short of positive disapprobation. Such of you as had the happiness of accompanying me when our Address was presented to the good King, must assuredly have rejoiced that you had given expression to feelings by which he was so evidently toucht, and which he declared would awaken sympathy and delight throughout all Germany (1). I could have wisht that other portions of our Church had testified their joy and gratitude in a like manner; but as it is, I feel most thankful that our Archdeaconry, though it stood almost alone, had the privilege of doing so. Doubtless, when the King of Prussia is hereafter pursuing his plans for strengthening and purifying Christ's Church in his own dominions,

should he look to the Church of England for aid in doing so, our Address will be an encouraging assurance that there is at least one portion of the English Church, which will rejoice and give thanks, when all the Reformed Churches can be united together in perfect union and communion.

The last year has been so rich in matters interesting to the Church, that I have left myself no time to speak to you, as I fain would have done, about the Meeting of our Convocation, and about the attempt made at that Meeting to prepare the way for a time, which, I trust, is not far distant, when the Convocation will be allowed to sit and discuss ecclesiastical questions (J). Nor can I say anything this year concerning our Rural Chapters. But on this point I forbear more willingly, having spoken at such length about them in the latter part of my last year's Charge, which, in the hope of aiding you in rendering them more efficient, I enlarged considerably as it was passing through the press. I will merely exhort you all again, the Rural Deans more especially, to go to these Meetings with the earnest purpose of receiving and conferring good. If you go there idly, thoughtlessly, as a matter of form, you will derive no benefit from them. But if you seek good, you will find it. And the same is the case, as you must often have told your congregations, even with our attendance at divine worship. I have reason to believe that similar institutions are about to be revived in other Dioceses; and among the benefits which may be expected from them, I trust they will prepare and fit us for the time when our whole Church shall assemble in synod (K).

I have had so many topics to speak of, that I must

entreat your forgiveness for the slight, cursory manner in which most of them have been handled. And now, ere I close, I will address a few words to you, my friends, who are come as Churchwardens to this Visitation. You also need advice and exhortation; and to you also I have given such as I could in my former Charges. Into the question of parochial discipline, for the reason mentioned above, I refrain from entering, until we know the aim and scope of the Bill about to be brought before Parliament. Nor will my scanty legal knowledge allow me to pronounce any opinion concerning the recent judgement, by which the subject of Churchrates has been involved in fresh perplexities. This matter must come again ere long before a judicial tribunal, if it be not settled by some legislative measure. The only point which I can urge upon you this year, is the same which I urged upon you at our former Visitations, that you should endeavour to do your duty in that which has long been the main and most important branch of your office, the repairing and restoring of your churches. It has been a great satisfaction to me to find that the advice and exhortation given in my former Charges was not thrown away. In several churches improvements have been commenced; in some they have been carried on upon a large scale. Here I feel bound to mention what has been done in Eastbourne church. If any person doubts the desirableness of scraping off the whitewash from the pillars and arches and the other stonework in our churches, let him go to Eastbourne church. He who remembers what it was two years ago, will be surprised at the change. I myself was so, though I had been prepared for it by seeing in my own church what a look of grandeur and antiquity is thus

given at once to a building. That of Eastbourne, which had never struck me much before, has now acquired something like the majesty of a cathedral. Many other churches, indeed the great majority of them, still need similar improvements; and I earnestly hope you may all determine not to let the next year pass without doing something in this way. Only be on your guard; when you have scraped off the whitewash, do not, as I have sometimes seen done, substitute a yellow wash or brown wash in its stead. By so doing you would defeat your object. Persons whose taste has never been rightly cultivated, and who have no apprehension of the imaginative associations whereby antiquity is hallowed, but who like everything to look new and bright, as though they drew their notion of beauty from a shop, will advise you to do this: but churches, at least old ones, ought to look old, not new, the older the better. It is delightful to think that a score of generations, or more, have gathered to worship within the same walls, within which we are now gathered. In truth you might as well greenwash an old oak, or dress it out in artificial leaves. Let the bare stone, when you have cleared it, stand in its original nakedness: the only additional work requisite will be, when there are any chasms or deficiences through the action of Time, or of other more mischievous destroyers, to fill them up.

Again, in many parishes there will be ample work for you in restoring your windows, in getting rid of the paltry wooden bars, which the niggardliness of former years has put up in them, and in substituting stone mullions according to the style of the architecture. Even churches that look mean and wretched, like that in which we are now assembled, might be so improved, that you would

hardly know them again, if the windows were properly restored, if the side-galleries were taken down, if the pews were swept away, if the stone pillars were stript of their white coating. This is the third year that I have felt called upon to condemn these architectural and ecclesiastical deformities. Little has been changed in most of our churches yet. But let us not be dispirited: I will not despair of seeing the high cumbrous pews, which cram and disfigure so many of our churches, and which seem designed for luxurious ease, rather than for the exercises of prayer, for the worship of self, rather than the worship of God,—I will not despair of seeing these unchristian encumbrances removed. So long as I continue in my present office, it will be my endeavour to get rid of such things in every church, where I can exercise any influence or authority; and as the conviction is spreading through the land, that closed pews are repugnant to the spirit of Christian worship, and that they occasion numberless quarrels and heartburnings, I trust the day will come when they will only be spoken of as among the evils of a bygone, irreligious age.

But when an abuse is so inveterate, and is surrounded by so many bad and jealous feelings, like a muddy moat, keeping off the approach of reason and charity, we cannot expect that it will fall at the first assault. This however must not deter us from directing the battering ram a second and a third time against it. Greatly too are we encouraged to do so, if we can perceive the walls shaking in any place, if we can perceive them giving way, if any breach is made in them. The walls of Jericho did not fall at the first circuit, although of the priests of the Lord, or at the first blast of their trumpets. For God

desires to try our patience and perseverance, when He sets us to perform His work. The priests had to compass Jericho day after day, and to blow their trumpets continually; and it was only on the seventh day, and at the seventh circuit on that day, that the people all lifted up their voices, and shouted with a great shout; and then the wall fell down flat. We have had many proofs of late years admonishing us that this is still the course which God ordains. Indeed history is full of such proofs. The priests of the Lord are first commanded to compass the walls of evil, and to blow the trumpets of the Lord against them. They are to do so continually, perseveringly, it may be for years, without any responsive voices from the people. But at length the people lift up their voices, and shout with a great shout; and the abuse falls down flat; and every one from that time forward tramples upon it. Such, to cite a single example, was the progress of public feeling with regard to the Slavetrade. Holy men moved by God declared His judgements against it: after a while the people lifted up their voices and joined in condemning it; and then it was abolisht. So too, I trust, will it be with this great moral abuse, the system of pews, against which, with God's help, I shall go on, along with my brethren, blowing the trumpet year after year, until at length the whole mass of them, through the length and breadth of England, will, I doubt not, fall down flat. Earnestly desiring peace and unity in all things, earnestly desiring that all the party-walls of selfishness and vanity and prejudice, which separate and estrange us from each other, should be knockt down, I likewise especially desire, as pertaining to my peculiar office, to knock down those walls which separate

and estrange us from each other within the house of God.

In conclusion I beg to state to you, my reverend brethren, that I have prepared an Address to our gracious Queen from the Clergy of this Archdeaconry, on her providential preservation from this second attack on her life; and I invite you all to sign your names to it. This is another mercy and blessing vouchsafed to us: and how many mercies and blessings have we to be thankful for! mercies and blessings without number! Let us devoutly endeavour to be thankful for them, and pray to God to give us the crowning blessing of thankful hearts, hearts united to Him and to each other in the holy fellowship of peace and love, through Him who came to unite us to His Father and ours.

NOTES.

Note A : p. 12.

The procedure of those historians, who pass over the Church of the middle ages, as though it were a mere blank, under the notion that the continuity of a pure faith was only preserved by the Waldenses, and other like persecuted sects, is pretty generally recognized now to be utterly unhistorical. For a historian's business is not to pick and choose out the figures that he likes to bring forward in his picture, omitting the rest, but to represent those whom God has placed in the foremost rank of influence and efficiency, according to the prominence which they actually bore. Nevertheless Milner's work still has a considerable reputation, and is the main, if not the sole, source from which a large portion of our Church derive their notions of ecclesiastical history. How deplorably deficient Milner was in the learning requisite for his undertaking, and how he disguised this want by taking his quotations from other writers, such as Fleury and Dupin, has been shewn by Mr Maitland in his Letters to Rose, with his own peculiar sagacity for ferreting out a plagiarist, and for detecting the jay under its borrowed plumes. Nor is the limited range of Milner's imagination, his inability to understand or sympathize with any other than one special modification of the Christian character, expressing itself under a particular form of words, less injurious to his history. Owing to this cause, it tends to narrow the minds of those who are already predisposed to be narrow through their Calvinistic exclusiveness, and encourages them in believing that there never

was a true Christian upon earth, except such as have made use of their shibboleth.

If however there is any force in the argument used by Mr Newman, in the following passage of his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, it seems to imply that the course taken by Milner is the only possible one for a historian of the Church. Taking the doctrine of papal infallibility as a hypothesis, he says (p. 129) that, "even as a hypothesis which has been held by one out of various communions, it may not be lightly put aside. Some hypothesis all parties, all controversialists, all historians must adopt, if they would treat of Christianity at all. Gieseler's "Text Book" bears the profession of being a dry analysis of Christian history; yet on inspection it will be found to be written on a positive and definite theory, and to bend facts to meet it. An unbeliever, as Gibbon, assumes one hypothesis; and an Ultramontane, as Baronius, adopts another. The school of Hurd and Newton consider that Christianity slept for centuries upon centuries, except among those whom historians call heretics. Others speak as if the Oath of supremacy or the *congé d'élire* could be made the measure of St Ambrose; and they fit the Thirty-nine Articles on the fervid Tertullian. The question is, which of all these theories is the simplest, the most natural, the most persuasive. Certainly the notion of development under infallible authority is not a less grave, a less winning hypothesis, than the chance and coincidence of events, or the Oriental Philosophy, or the working of Antichrist, to account for the rise of Christianity, and the formation of its theology." These sentences are a characteristic sample of the sophistries, of which this extraordinary book is made up; and coming as they do from a writer of such ability, whom so many have revered as their master, it is worth while to spend a few minutes in examining them. Here in the first place let me observe that the presumption in favour of Mr Newman's view is gained in each branch of the argument by the same artifice, by placing it in contrast with hypotheses grossly absurd, as though these were the only alternatives; which moreover are in neither instance

altogether *ejusdem generis*, and cannot fairly be compared with it. Thus, if there were no more reasonable mode of "accounting for the rise of Christianity and the formation of its theology," than by ascribing it to "the chance and coincidence of events," or to "the Oriental Philosophy," or to "the working of Antichrist," we might be inclined to say that to ascribe it to "development under infallible authority" is less absurd and irrational than such fantastical follies. But what man of sound judgement ever dreamt of "accounting for the rise of Christianity and the formation of its theology" by any one of those three solutions? though many may have asserted, with unquestionable truth, that the development of Christianity, and especially of its theology, has been more or less modified by the coincidence of outward events, and in its earlier centuries by Oriental Philosophy, and in all ages, alas, too powerfully by the working of Antichrist, whose chief instrument has been the Papacy. When you put a heap of nonsense into your adversary's mouth, it becomes an easy matter to refute him: and this has ever been the course adopted by the advocates of Rome, who have seldom been scrupulous about any form of truth. Suppose however we say that the Seed which was sown by the Divine Sower has been growing and expanding ever since, that the Leaven has been working and spreading, through its own inherent power, adapted as that power is to the better properties of the soil in which it was sown, of the lump with which it was mixt up. Suppose that this growth and expansion, this working and spreading, have been superintended and directed by Him who orders and overrules the whole course of occurrences in the moral as well as in the physical world, and whose Spirit has especially undertaken the charge and government of the Church of His Son. Suppose that, since the Church was not taken out of the world, so as to be entirely severed from it, but was to flow along through the midst of it, and to penetrate into every part of it, until the whole was fertilized, the circumstances of the world in each age, the speculations of human reason, the various feelings and passions of mankind, were allowed in some measure to shape and turn its course,

though precluded from wholly arresting or diverting it. What is there in such suppositions,—which are much more like the views taken by judicious Protestant historians,—that should make us look with the slightest favour on the notion of "development under an infallible authority" as "graver" or "more winning?" Besides, as I said, this alternative is not *ejusdem generis*. By putting it as he has done, Mr Newman slips in a mere hypothesis, or, as we should maintain, a gross fiction, on the same footing with acknowledged indisputable facts. For in all ages of the Church there must needs have been a coincidence of events, reacting more or less upon that which acted upon them: the Oriental Philosophy, we know, did exist, and came into contact with Christianity, and acted upon it in some of the early heresies: Antichrist too has been continually counterworking and undermining Christianity, and attempting to corrupt it in numberless ways. But when the development of Christianity under an infallible authority is placed along with these facts, as co-ordinate with them, the very point in question is assumed, namely, the existence of an infallible authority, which, in the sense of its being embodied in any permanent human representative, we peremptorily deny. Nor, even if it did exist, would it preclude the operation of the other influences mentioned, that of coincident events, that of Oriental Philosophy, and that of Antichrist. For no advocate of papal infallibility has asserted that this has been the sole cause of the rise of Christianity, and of the formation of its theology: least of all can Mr Newman do so, who ascribes such moment to heresies in the development of the Church.

In like manner Mr Newman's remark on the histories of the Church, which led me to quote the passage, and from which by his peculiar logic he would draw an argument in favour of papal infallibility, is constructed as though for the purpose of throwing dust in one's eyes. He enumerates certain hypothetical views, which he represents as having been assumed by divers ecclesiastical historians: some of these views he puts in an extravagant, almost in a ludicrous light: hence he would have us infer that all ecclesiastical history is much of the same kind; and he

gravely winds up by saying, "The question is, which of all these theories is the simplest, the most natural, the most persuasive." This is one of the stalest tricks of a shallow scepticism, that, having no aptness for perceiving anything but the negative side of things, confounds every shade and degree of truth with gross glaring falsehood, sets them all on the same level, shews that some of the class are very absurd, and then would make you conclude that all the rest are of a piece. Even in Mr Newman's closing question the same sceptical spirit manifests itself. A person who believed in truth, and in man's being gifted with faculties for discerning truth, would have said, *The question is, which of all these theories is the true one.* We do not want to know which is "the simplest, the most natural, the most persuasive." Falsehood will often have a look of simplicity. It will often seem very natural, inasmuch as from the constitution of our perceptive organs that which is objectively false is often subjectively or phenomenally true. Thus, for instance, the notion of the sun's revolving round the earth is much simpler and more natural, according to the judgement of the unpurged intellect, than that of the earth's revolving round the sun; although, as simplicity is ever an essential character of the highest truths, the latter notion is seen after a time to take its place in a far simpler and more natural theory of the universe. As to *persuasiveness*, that it attaches itself to errour and falsehood much more readily than to truth, was the boast of the ancient sophists, and the main stay of their craft: and the whole history of mankind, from the first temptation down to the last secessions to Rome, has proved that the father of lies is indeed the prince of this world.

Another cause of entanglement is introduced into Mr Newman's argument by his using the words *hypothesis* and *theory* indiscriminately, as if they were synonymous. Mr Newman's want of precision in the use of philosophical terms, and how he is led into fallacies thereby, has already been noticed by others. In the present instance his confusion is indeed sanctioned by vulgar abuse; but the merest tiro in logic must know how great and

important are the differences between a *hypothesis* and a *theory*; and when the whole stress of the argument lies on these words, precision is indispensable. A hypothesis, as such, is a thing alien from history, and which a historian ought carefully to eschew, except in cases where the scantiness of his materials compells him to supply their deficiencies by conjecture. On the other hand all intelligent contemplation, whether of facts or objects, in their connexion with one another, is a theory. To the framing of a theory many hypotheses may minister: for the meaning and causes and relations and concatenations of objects or of facts do not disclose themselves immediately to our perceptions, but often need to be deciphered by a complex process of divination. When a hypothesis however has received the confirmation and verification of experience,—when it is proved to be the true key, by unlocking those secret chambers of knowledge from which we were previously excluded,—it ceases to be a mere hypothesis, and becomes a theory, or a member of a theory; just as a prophecy, when it has been fulfilled, ceases to be a mere prophecy: and we have no right to speak contemptuously of such a hypothesis, or of such a prophecy, as though it were something vague and problematical. As in organic bodies the whole is ever something very different from a mere aggregate of its parts,—for that aggregate omits the unifying principle which organizes them into a whole, changing and modifying them all,—so is it in the region of ideas. Though a number of hypotheses may have contributed to the making up of a theory, the theory is something very different from a mere chain or concourse of hypotheses. Even a house is something very different from a heap of bricks, plus a heap of tiles, plus a lump of mortar, plus so many planks of deal. The confounding of theories with hypotheses, and the speaking of them in a mass, as if they were equivalent or identical, belongs to the essence of scepticism, and is one of the marks of that pernicious spirit which the thoughtful reader has long discerned with pain in Mr Newman's writings. It belongs also to the essence of Romanism, which cannot maintain its claim to be the one arbiter of right and truth, except by

denying the existence of any other power to discern them. For Mr Newman's immediate argument too the confusion is of much importance; since one cannot speak of the *theory* of papal infallibility, except in that perverse sense in which theory is identified with hypothesis. The notion of papal infallibility is a mere hypothesis, a monstrous supposition, or, to use a word of Coleridge's, sufficion, resting on no ground but the most arbitrary fancies, and asserted in open defiance to the evidence of all history, which absolutely rejects and disproves it.

As to the historians of the Church, I cannot here enter upon the question, how far any of them have been able to keep clear of arbitrary hypotheses, and to give a faithful objective history. That such a thing is wholly impracticable, is not proved by shewing that divers writers have not effected it. At least there are various degrees of approximation; and if this idea stand, as it ought, before the historian, as the end to be aimed at, he who has the true historical mind may approach indefinitely near to it. Nor will I examine how far Mr Newman's criticism on Gieseler's work is wellfounded. His assertion, that it "bears the profession of being a dry analysis of Christian history," is at all events contrary to the fact: in sooth one cannot well conceive any writer making such a blasting profession about his work. Gieseler does indeed profess that his text is merely designed to serve as a textbook (*Lehrbuch*) for his Lectures. Thus it is in some measure analogous to Mosheim's *Institutes*, the true character of which has been well pointed out by Mr Maitland in the Letters already referred to, in reply to the complaints of persons seeking for something different from what that learned historian designed to give. But a summary is not a "dry analysis," except through a confusion of terms like that which overlooks the difference between a hypothesis and a theory: and Gieseler adds, that, "in the selection and arrangement of his historical materials, he has always kept a twofold object in view, *to give a general, but clear and full picture of each age, and to bring forward the causal connexion and reciprocal action of the various series of developments everywhere in a clear light.*" And because "no age can be rightly

understood, unless one hears it speak in its own words, and this is especially true of the history of the Church," he has tried to make each age express itself, by giving a copious body of extracts from the original authors in his notes. According to Mr Newman, he has a "positive and definite theory, and bends facts to meet it." Whether he does the latter, is a question of detail, which, as no instances are cited, cannot well be investigated. Nor is it material to my purpose. It may be that his very freedom from the assumptions and hypotheses which lie at the bottom of the ordinary English notions of ecclesiastical history, may be regarded by Mr Newman as "a positive and definite theory;" and his not receiving the ordinary English interpretation of certain historical statements may perhaps be called "bending facts to meet" his theory. But whether he does this or not, his aim at least is different. As it is with the facts of physical science, so is it with those of which history takes cognizance. A sceptic of Mr Newman's school might quote half a dozen interpretations of natural phenomena out of Aristotle, out of the Schoolmen, out of the Alchemists and Mystics, and might then argue that, since all science consists of mere fanciful hypotheses, it is indispensably necessary, in order to man's understanding the outward world, in which he is placed, with which he is bound up by so many ties, on which he depends for the support of his existence, that there should be some infallible authority appointed to expound the laws of nature. But we know that, notwithstanding this proneness to fanciful hypotheses, notwithstanding the various idols by which physical enquirers have perpetually been deluded, still man's intellectual eye may be so purged, as to gain a continually increasing insight into the true forms and laws of the outward world: a *lumen siccum* is granted to those who sincerely and earnestly desire to discern the real nature of things: and thus Physical Science has been enabled to erect a vast fabric of substantial knowledge. Indeed the very notion that it had an infallible authority in Aristotle operated for many ages to mislead and check the researches of naturalists, as ever must be the effect of such delusions, whatever the imaginary authority may be: and it

was only when Philosophy got rid of this encumbrance, and adopted a right method in the study and interpretation of nature, that Science came forth from the cloudland of hypothesis, and began to walk in the clear daylight of observant, careful, progressive theory.

It is true, the difficulties which stand in the way of an impartial objective history, such as shall do justice to all men in a spirit of love, without distinction of persons, are much greater, inasmuch as our feelings are far otherwise affected by human interests and actions and sufferings and struggles, than by anything in inanimate nature. Nor is the difficulty in any secular history, at least of bygone ages, equal to what it must needs be in that of the Church, where the matters agitated concern and stir the very centre of our being, and controversies are transmitted from century to century with very slight variations in their outward form. Yet that even here the spirit of Christian love can in great measure surmount every obstacle, so as to recognize and appreciate whatever is akin to it, notwithstanding the diversities of forms and opinions, has been proved in our days by Neander.

NOTE B : p. 17.

IN his *Apology*, addrest to William Abbot of St Theoderic, Bernard, pleading in behalf of certain diversities of dress and observance between the Cistercian and Cluniac monasteries, says (c. III.): "An forte quia juxta alium Ordinem conversari videor, propterea suspectus hinc habeor? Sed eadem ratione et vos nostro derogatis, quicumque aliter vivitis. Ergo et continentes et conjuges invicem se damnare putentur, quod suis quique legibus in ecclesia conversentur. Monachi quoque ac regulares Clerici sibi invicem derogare dicantur, quia propriis ab invicem observantiis separantur. Sed et Noe et Danielem et Job in uno se regno pati non posse suspicemur, ad quod utique non eos uno tramite justitiae cognovimus pervenisse. Mariam denique et Martham necesse sit aut utramque, aut alteram Salvatori

displicere, cui nimirum tam dissimili studio devotionis contendunt ambae placere. Et hac ratione in tota Ecclesia, (quae utique tam pluribus, tamque dissimilibus variatur ordinibus, utpote Regina quae in Psalmo legitur *circumamicta varietatibus*,) nulla pax, nulla prorsus concordia esse putabitur. Quae etenim secura quies, quis tutus in ea status invenietur, si unus quilibet homo, unum quemlibet Ordinem eligens, alios aliter viventes aut ipse aspernetur, aut se ab ipsis sperni suspicetur, praesertim cum tenere impossibile sit vel unum hominem omnes Ordines vel unum Ordinem omnes homines? Non sum tam hebes, ut non agnoscam tunicam Joseph, non illius qui liberavit Aegyptum, sed qui salvavit mundum, et hoc non a fame corporis, sed a morte simul animae et corporis. Notissima quippe est, quia polymita, id est pulcherrima varietate distincta; sed et sanguine apparet intincta, non quidem hoedi, qui peccatum significat, sed agni, qui designat innocentiam, hoc est, suo ipsius, non alieno. Ipse est profecto Agnus mansuetissimus, qui coram non quidem tondente, sed occidente se obmutuit; qui peccatum non fecit, sed abstulit peccata mundi. Miserunt autem qui dicerent ad Jacob: *Hanc invenimus; vide utrum tunica filii tui sit, an non.* Vide et Tu Domine, utrum haec sit tunica dilecti Filii Tui. Recognosce, omnipotens Pater, eam quam fecisti Christo Filio Tuo polymitam, dando quidem quosdam Apostolos, quosdam autem Prophetas, alios vero Evangelistas, alios Pastores et Doctores, et caetera quae in ejus ornatu mirifico decenter apposuisti, ad consummationem utique sanctorum occurrentium in virum perfectum, in mensuram aetatis plenitudinis Christi.—Relinquat videlicet sponsae suae Ecclesiae pignus haereditatis, ipsam tunicam suam, tunicam scilicet polymitam, eamdemque inconsutilem, et desuper contextam per totum; sed polymitam ob multorum Ordinum qui in ea sunt multimodam distinctionem; inconsutilem vero propter indissolubilis caritatis individuam unitatem. *Quis me*, inquit, *separabit a caritate Christi?* Audi quomodo polymitam. *Divisiones*, ait, *gratiarum sunt, idem autem Spiritus; et divisiones operationum sunt, idem vero Dominus.* Deinde diversis enumeratis charismatibus, tamquam variis tunicae coloribus, quibus constet

eam esse polymitam, ut ostendat etiam esse inconsutilem, et desuper contextam per totum, adjungit: *Haec autem operatur unus atque idem Spiritus, dividens singulis prout vult. Caritas* quippe *diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum qui datus est nobis.* Non ergo dividatur, sed totam et integram haereditario jure sortiatur Ecclesia, quia et de illa scriptum est: *Adstitit Regina a dextris tuis in vestitu deaurato, circumdata varietate.* Itaque diversi diversa accipientes dona, alius quidem sic, alius vero sic, sive Cluniacenses, sive Cistercienses, sive Clerici regulares, sive etiam Laici fideles, omnis denique Ordo, omnis lingua, omnis sexus, omnis aetas, omnis conditio, in omni loco, per omne tempus, a primo homine usque ad novissimum.—Et quid mirum si in hoc exsilio, peregrinante adhuc Ecclesia, quaedam hujuscemodi sit pluralis (ut ita dixerim) unitas, unaque pluralitas; cum in illa quoque patria, quando jam ipsa regnabit, nihilominus forte talis aliqua dispar quodammodo aequalitas futura sit? Inde etenim scriptum est: *In domo Patris mei mansiones multae sunt.* Sicut itaque illic multae mansiones in una domo, ita hic multi Ordines sunt in Ecclesia una; et quomodo hic *divisiones gratiarum sunt, idem autem Spiritus*, ita ibi distinctiones quidem gloriarum, sed una domus.—Non igitur una tantum semita inceditur, quia nec una est mansio quo tenditur. Viderit autem quisque quacumque incedat, ne pro diversitate semitarum ab una justitia recedat, quoniam ad quamlibet mansionem sua quisque semita pervenerit, ab una domo Patris exsors non erit."

Bernard's immediate purpose in this Treatise is indeed merely to prove the allowableness and fitness and necessity of outward ceremonial differences, and their compatibleness with inward essential unity: hence this passage would have found its appropriate place in *Note Yh* to the Sermon on *the Unity of the Church.* The scanty collection in that Note should also have been enricht with the excellent letter of Peter the Venerable to Bernard on occasion of the same dissensions between the Cluniac and Cistercian monks. Bernard's arguments and illustrations however go far beyond his direct purpose, and shew that the diversities allowable within the Church do not relate solely to externals.

NOTE C: p. 19.

THESE offenses against decorum and Christian feeling are by no means confined to either of the two parties by which our Church is at present distracted; and it would require a far more extensive acquaintance than I possess with the refuse literature of the day to pronounce on which side those offenses have been the most numerous and the most flagrant. In fact this is one of the curses of party-spirit, that people are continually provoking one another to hatred and to evil works, especially to evil words. Nor has the spirit of detraction and slander, the spirit which takes no thought about truth and justice, if it can say anything injurious to an adversary, found vent solely among the anonymous rabble who haunt the allies and purlieus of theology. Only a few even of the leading minds have kept themselves wholly untainted by it. Mr Newman indeed has always shewn a singular forbearance, notwithstanding the harassing assaults he has continually had to endure; and his conduct in this respect has been the more exemplary, since, with his powers of logic and of ridicule, he might easily have rode over troop after troop of his assailants. But others, who have not had the same temptations, have been unable to resist their lesser ones. Even in those religious novels, which are another anomalous growth of our ephemeral literature, and which, professing to be the offspring of the religious imagination, are commonly equally destitute of imagination and of religion, we often find the abuse of the opposite party brought in to season what might else have been utterly mawkish.

For instance, on opening *Bernard Leslie*, my eyes fall on the following passage. "I used once to respect the Evangelicals. Notwithstanding the manifest deficiency of their scheme, I have been accustomed to regard them with a certain respect, on account of their zeal, and the partial good which they have doubtless been the instruments of effecting. And there are some for whom I still feel a sincere regard,—men whom I see quietly doing the Lord's work according to their judgement. Zeal in a good cause is to be

admired, even though it be not according to knowledge. They have also numbered amongst them many revered and excellent men, who have devoted themselves sincerely to the cause of what they considered truth. Indeed it is for their sake mainly that the party to which they belonged has gained its influence and credit. But their popularity has spoiled them, as it has done thousands before them. They have now stood forward in a new light. They are no longer contending for the souls of men, but struggling to maintain a waning popularity. They see growing up around them, perhaps settling in their own parishes or neighbourhood, a zealous and laborious body of men who have devoted themselves to restore the ancient energy and purity of the Church. These men are gradually gaining an influence over the public mind to the prejudice and annoyance of the Evangelicals. Hence their rage against them; and because these men blame as defective the effete Evangelicalism of the day, they are accused of being enemies to the Reformation; and because they endeavour to restore the ancient usages of the Church, which have been sinfully neglected, they are accused of popery, and held up as departers from the Church's discipline by men who err themselves in a tenfold greater and more dangerous degree. The effrontery with which these men accuse their brethren is marvellous. The daily newspapers and monthly magazines have been filled with false charges and injurious reports against those who are endeavouring to raise the tone of religion. Instead of that generous rivalry which ought to influence men engaged in the same great cause of winning souls to Christ, there has sprung up amongst the Evangelicals a bitter hostility and ungenerous jealousy: they bar the kingdom of heaven against men; they neither go in themselves, nor suffer those that are entering to go in:" pp. 283-285.

Now there may certainly be a few persons here and there, to whom some portion of the condemnation here pronounced against the main body of those denominated Evangelicals, is not wholly inapplicable; but if we take it as a sentence against that body, it is iniquitous. Nor can one well display grosser ignorance of what has been going on in our Church during the last

dozen years. For so far are the "evangelical" body from having lost their popularity in consequence of the new movement in a different direction, that this movement has been the means of rendering them popular, and of diverting that odium from them with which the world is wont to regard such as bring religion prominently before it. The new party may appeal to this as a note of their superior sanctity; or it may arise from the obtrusiveness of their outward acts and observances: at all events the fact is such. As the passage just quoted bears the authority of a respectable name, and is taken from a work which has gone through several editions, and consequently must have obtained a wide circulation, it seems desirable that statements, which, though wholly contrary to the truth, may easily gain credence, should be met by a flat contradiction. At least my own official experience enables me to state that in this archdeaconry the number of what are called evangelical clergy is every year increasing: and it is with deep thankfulness to God that I record this, the introduction of such a minister being a pledge that the spiritual welfare of the parish will be rightly taken care of, and that the Gospel will be preacht in its life-giving power and fulness. Nor is it long in most cases before the proofs that the popularity of such ministers is not "waning," shew themselves in the increast size and orderliness and devoutness of the congregations.

It is not easy to estimate how wide the mischief of such misrepresentations must needs be: for minds that have been dieted with writings leavened by such a spirit must become full of narrow prejudices, so as to be almost incapable of recognizing goodness in any one who does not belong to the same party. But still more mischievous is the practice, which unhappily is not uncommon, of introducing the same sort of religious polemics into books for children. Children should be trained to look with reverence on everything connected with religion. Irreverence will come too soon, without our taking pains to sow and foster it. They who teach their children to look with suspicion and to laugh at any professions of religion, or any peculiarities prevalent among its professors, are training them to be sceptics and scoffers: nor can I

see what other results are to be anticipated from such books as *the Fairy Bower* and *the Lost Brooch*, which are all the more dangerous on account of their cleverness.

NOTE D: p. 20.

SEE Coleridge's Apologetic Preface to *Fire, Famine, and Slaughter*. In his *Remains* (Vol. IV. p. 76), when numbering up several reasons for recommending the study of our older writers he mentions, among other benefits to be derived from them, "The conquest of party and sectarian prejudices, when you have on the same table before you the works of a Hammond and a Baxter, and reflect how many and momentous their points of agreement, how few and almost childish the differences which estranged and irritated these good men. Let us but imagine what their blessed spirits now feel at the retrospect of their earthly frailties; and can we do other than strive to feel as they now feel, not as they once felt? So will it be with the disputes between good men of the present day; and if you have no other reason to doubt your opponent's goodness than the point in dispute, think of Baxter and Hammond, of Milton and Taylor, and let it be no reason at all."

NOTE E: p. 27.

ACCORDING to the returns received from 103 parishes, the aggregate population of which amounts by the last census to 116443, the number of illegitimate children baptized in those parishes during the six years, 1829—1834, was 934; and during the six years, 1835—1840, it was 1133. That this awful increase, an increase far beyond what can have taken place in the population of those parishes during that period,—Brighton not being included amongst them,—is imputable to the alterations with regard to Bastardy enacted by the New Poorlaw, I would by no means

assert, or insinuate. In Sir Edmund Head's valuable paper on the subject, appended to *the Sixth Annual Report of the Poorlaw Commissioners*, it is justly remarkt with reference to similar statements drawn from ten counties, exhibiting a like increase, that this increase cannot fairly be ascribed to the law, without regard to the various circumstances by which its operation may have been affected; and he points out one or two of these, in proof that a conclusion deduced from such tables would be fallacious. Not however that these circumstances would all tend to raise the number of such baptisms: in the text I have alluded to some causes which might have been expected to diminish it. Such too must doubtless have been the effect of the new system of Registration, which was introduced almost contemporaneously with the New Poorlaw. The difficulty which the lower orders often find in obtaining respectable sponsors, induces many to take their children to the Meeting-house; and this difficulty will of course press most on the mothers of illegitimate children; who may also be led by shame to choose a civil registration, in preference to a ceremony involving some degree of exposure, and who in most cases are not likely to attach much value to the spiritual benefits of Baptism. These considerations prove that the number of Baptisms of illegitimate children cannot in the present state of things be regarded as tantamount to that of births: how far it may fall short I have no means of determining. But at all events it is clear that the sanguine expectations which were entertained in some quarters, that the New Poorlaw would of itself materially lessen the amount of Bastardy, have not been fulfilled; and that the encouragement which the Commissioners in their early Reports drew from a few favorable cases, was at all events premature. It was indeed perfectly right, nay, the bounden duty of the Legislature, to abolish that pernicious system, through which, under the old law, illegitimate children, in proportion to their number, became sources of profit to their mother. But it is a delusion, though one we are very apt to fall into in politics and in morals, to suppose that, when an evil habit has been produced, the removal of the producing cause will check the habit. For the cause, when it

is outward, does not really generate the evil, but merely elicits and fosters it; and when the evil has once sprung up, it has a strong tenacity, and propagates itself. The only efficient mode of counteracting moral evil is by exciting a countervailing moral power; and to do this is the special office and privilege of the Church. "Commonwealths and good governments (Bacon teaches us in his Essay *Of Custom and Education*) do nourish virtue grown, but do not much mend the seeds." The State must take care that its laws and institutions shall not thwart the Church in her work, must provide that she be not hindered in it, and that she have facilities for its execution; but her real strength, the means and instruments of her warfare, come from a higher source: and every fresh testimony of the gigantic might of evil in the world should lead us to seek that strength more earnestly, and to exercise it more diligently and perseveringly.

Here let me add a remark intimately connected with what has just been said. Whatever may be the effect of those clauses in the New Poorlaw, which bear directly upon Bastardy,—whether in their original form, or as they have since been modified,—there is one regulation, no way necessary to its enforcement, but deemed expedient by the persons who are entrusted with its administration, whereby it certainly does operate most perniciously on the morals of such women as are under the necessity of seeking parochial relief. The ordinary practice in workhouses,—I know not whether there are any in which a better system has been adopted,—is to put the adult female paupers into one class, so that they all live in the same room, and spend their whole time together. Now everybody who is acquainted with our workhouses, is aware that a great proportion of the female inmates ever consists of those who resort to them to bring forth the offspring of their sin. Thus a large part of the most abandoned women within the limits of each Union are herded together; and with these the rest of the female paupers have to associate all the day long. Yet, even as a matter of right, surely it is a most unjustifiable insult and wrong to the virtuous maidens and mothers, who at times are compelled by

distress to take up their abode in a workhouse, that they should thus be doomed to a constant intercourse with the worst women for ten miles round. It is a crime to punish them for their poverty by condemning them to be thus shockt and disgusted. And how terrible must be the demoralizing effect produced on the pure and modest maiden and matron by the conversation, to which in such company they must perpetually be exposed! Nay, even among the wretched women who seek shelter in the workhouse, there must needs be very different degrees of depravity, from the girl whose weakness has just been seduced out of the path of a life hitherto blameless, down to those who have been hardened by continued prostitution. But the natural result of such intercourse is for the lowest to drag down the rest to their own miserable level. Hence it is a national duty to demand that a strict system of classification shall be laid down for the female paupers in our workhouses. Let the modest women live together; but let them be preserved from the degradation and pollution of a compulsory association with the profligate: and with regard to the latter too care should be taken that the lingering remains of better feelings should not be rudely trampled on and extinguisht, that the workhouse should not be a place for rendering all the women who enter it utterly shameless. The regulations necessary for this purpose should be imposed by the Commissioners; for it will require some trouble and expense to carry them out, from which some Boards of Guardians might perhaps shrink: but the expense will be as a grain of dust, in comparison with the tremendous evil which it is to counteract; and, like every outlay for a moral purpose, it will bring in an abundant return, even in an economical point of view. Of all sources of national wealth, the best and surest is the moral character of the people.

Note F: p. 32.

Having spoken somewhat strongly on this point, I feel bound to add in this Note, that, when our present Bishop, in the autumn of 1843, issued his Pastoral Letter, directing that a general parochial collection should be made in aid of our Diocesan Association, with especial reference to the works it has undertaken for the improvement of Education, there were only five parishes in this Archdeaconry that did not respond to his call. In some at least of these five the omission must have been owing to accident; and all, I hope, will be anxious to repair the misfortune of their previous deficiency by a twofold liberality when another occasion is offered to them. That this must needs occur before long, is evident from the present state of our finances. The inevitable expenses of maintaining our two Training Schools are still considerably beyond our regular income: yet I should shrink with grief and shame from the thought that we can ever be reduced to the necessity of giving up Institutions, which were establisht in the trust that the Christian spirit of the Diocese would readily supply the funds requisite for their support, and which of all institutions are the most needed, nay, are absolutely indispensable, if the Church is to fulfill her duty of training up the hearts and minds of her children for an intelligent reception of the truths committed to her keeping. In our days the question is no longer, whether the lower orders shall have a Christian education, or shall be left in ignorance, to walk in the traditional faith of their fathers. The alternative is, whether they shall have Christian instruction, or only unchristian; whether they shall be abandoned, without any means of defending themselves, to the restless propagaters of infidelity, or shall be prepared to encounter them by being enabled to give a reason for their faith. But if they are to be so prepared, we need a large body of intelligent Christian teachers, a body scarcely less numerous than that of our parochial Clergy; and it is to supply this pressing and momentous

want that our Training Schools have been establisht. All the reports of their progress, and of the conduct of the teachers who have been trained in them, encourage us to hope that, under God's blessing, they will prove efficient instruments for the preservation of His people in the faith and knowledge of His Son. Therefore μὴ γένοιτο that we should ever be compelled to relinquish them. This thought is not to be entertained for a moment, but only how we may render them fitter for the execution of their great and godly purpose. Nor is it to be regretted that we should have to call upon our parishioners for their support: rather is it desirable that the great body of the inhabitants of every parish in the Diocese should be invited every year to bear part in the good works which the Church is carrying on. One of the best ways of elevating their character will be by bringing them to recognise their Christian privilege of caring for the moral and spiritual wants of all to whom they are united by the bonds of Christian brotherhood.

NOTE G: p. 35.

THE feelings exprest in the text have doubtless been entertained by many who have not given voice to them. Indeed I cannot well conceive that any one of a Christian frame of mind can have allowed his thoughts to dwell for a moment on the abuse here reprehended, without being struck by its glaring repugnance to the principles of the Gospel. It has given me much satisfaction to find that a change somewhat like the one here recommended has been adopted in the Reports of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel for 1844 and 1845; at the end of which, instead of the old lists of all the subscribers, there is merely a table of the sums received from the various District and Parochial Associations. Even in a financial view the change would be beneficial, as greatly diminishing the labour of making out the lists, and the expense of printing; only it is still deemed requisite to give full lists of the subscribers in the special Diocesan

Reports. We may hope however that this too will ere long be found to be superfluous.

A comparison of the Reports for 1841 and 1845 shews that the efforts which have been made to awaken a livelier interest in the missionary work of the Church, have not been wholly unavailing: for the contributions from this Diocese, which in 1841 were only £535, amounted in 1845 to £1360. I mention this as an encouragement to those who have taken part in these efforts, that they may persevere, and, having done thus much, may strive to do more; and also as an inducement to those who have hitherto been withheld by the fear that their parishioners could not be led to care for objects so remote from the concerns of their daily life. Let us all resolve that we will at least do something; and if we act heartily upon this resolution, we shall do more than we dream of. The number of parishes in this Diocese being about three hundred, surely it is not unreasonable to expect that they should raise a sum amounting on an average to ten pounds a parish, for the great work of propagating the Gospel in the vast colonies and dependencies of the English Empire. The sum we raise at present does not amount to five pounds a parish: but let us endeavour to double it; and doubtless in time we shall do so. And when we have doubled it, why should we not hope to double it again? Our worldly riches have multiplied prodigiously during the last fifty years: hitherto there has not been a proportionate increase in the portion of them given to God: but why should there not be?

Note H: p. 38.

It would have been out of place in the Charge itself, to have entered into a discussion of the painful controversy which has arisen out of the institution of the Jerusalem Bishopric. But as the controversy has not subsided even now, though the Bishopric has existed for five years,—as the attacks upon it have been carried on with unscrupulous virulence, and often with little

regard for truth,—as men of high character, not merely for learning, but for holiness, have not shrunk from making use of gross misrepresentations and personalities for the sake of kindling an odium against it,—as the plainest, most palpable demonstration of the incorrectness of these misrepresentations has not induced the authors to retract them, while their reputation has gained credence for their mis-statements with those who, knowing little, are ready to think evil, of whatever lies without the pale of our own Church, and has thus excited a prejudice against the Bishopric, which its friends, not suspecting the artifices used by its opponents, are not well able to refute,—there is much need that somebody should set forth a brief, simple view of the original scheme, whereby it will be cleared at once from a number of these misrepresentations and misapprehensions. Moreover, as by two several invitations addrest to the Clergy of this Archdeaconry I called upon them to express their approbation of the measure, and as these invitations were hailed with cordial sympathy by a large part of them, I have incurred a sort of obligation to vindicate it; since, in giving their public sanction to it, many may have been influenced more or less by a reliance on the judgement of their Archdeacon; so that, if it is really objectionable, either on religious grounds, or as a violation of sound ecclesiastical principles, he has made himself responsible for their errour, as well as for his own.

Now in order to arrive at a right understanding on this matter, it is requisite that we should recur to the original idea and purpose of the Jerusalem Bishopric; with regard to which we are happily supplied with an abundance of documentary evidence. The scheme originated, as is well known, in the mind of the great and good King, whom God, for the blessing of his own country and of Christendom, has placed upon the throne of Prussia. Amid the momentous cares which prest upon him from all sides at his accession, within six weeks of it, when he signed the Treaty of the 15th of July 1840 for the preservation of the Porte, one main inducement with him to become a party to that Treaty, we are informed in the Official Statement of the Proceedings with regard to the Bishopric, was the hope

of effecting something for the protection of Christians in the Turkish Empire. "His first thought was, that such a singular opportunity ought to be used for the good of the Holy Land, and of all Christendom, in the true spirit of the Evangelical Confession, and for the special advantage of its members. It seemed to him possible and eminently desirable that the powers of Christendom should come to an understanding with each other, and with the Porte which called for their protection, on these points, particularly with regard to the Holy Land; and that this would have been a noble, a holy alliance, injurious to none, glorious to the present time, beneficial to the future" (pp. 27, 30). Negotiations were commenced for this end, but without the desired result: some of the contracting parties seem to have been unwilling to enter into any such engagement. Still the King would not give up the hope of carrying his plan into effect, at least for his own Protestant Confession; and of this he took the widest view, looking at it not merely in his own kingdom of Prussia, but as extending through all Germany, nay, as embracing the whole Protestant body. "Where now (it is askt in the Official Statement) was the point to start from? It was to be one which should preclude all suspicion of selfish views, which should of itself condemn all exclusiveness, and in which the primary principles of the independence of each member and the union of all should find the clearest possible enunciation." The King desired "to obtain a centre for all the national Churches of the Evangelical Confession, that might be willing to join in the scheme either now or hereafter;—an institution which should not be subject to any exclusive rights, still less dependent on the commands of any civil power, or destined solely for one Confession, for one language, for one form of worship. To connect this with something already existing seemed to him the only right course, the only one consistent with the will of God. Now certain English Christians, members of the Society for the Conversion of the Jews, had procured a piece of ground a few years before on Mount Zion to build a church and schools. The building was

already begun; and divine service was performed in English, in Hebrew, and also in German, for Christians residing there, and for Jewish converts." Here was the starting-point. "The object however was to transform the small foundation of a private society into an independent Church, and to place this under the protection of the two chief Protestant powers" (p. 31). In the Instructions given to his Minister, a paper evidently drawn up by the King himself, and such as has rarely proceeded from any soverein, after speaking of the necessity that the Protestant Church should shew itself at Jerusalem, like the other branches of the Church, as one distinct body, in order to obtain a recognition of the rights of its members, he continues: "But his Majesty's conviction that the Evangelical Church ought to come forward on this occasion, as united in a common faith, rests mainly on higher grounds. The present aspect of Turkish affairs, which manifestly has not been brought about without divine guidance, and especially the political relation of England and Prussia with Turkey, have for the first time afforded a possibility for Evangelical Christendom to demand a position in the birthplace of Christianity, by the side of the ancient Churches of the East, and over against that of Rome, as a coordinate member of the Universal Church of Christ; so that the Gospel may be preacht freely, and that the members of the Evangelical Confession may enjoy liberty and security of worship. This moment is an important one in the history of the world: according as we attend to it and use it, or overlook and neglect it, will the Evangelical Church be judged by History and by God. His Majesty cannot doubt that Evangelical Christendom owes it to herself and to her Lord, at such a moment, in such a place, not to exhibit the scandal of her disunion and division, but rather the good example of unity in faith, and union in action. She desires to come forward there, along with the other ecclesiastical bodies, and in presence of the Jews and Mahometans, not for the sake of persecuting, of dispossessing, of excluding, not to quarrel, to dissolve: she desires to proclaim her mission to the world, not as a work of hatred and jealousy, but as

a message of love, of peace, and of concord. How then can it be the will of the Lord, that, when appearing for the first time in the Holy Land, for such a purpose, with such words in her mouth, she should unfurl the standard of her internal divisions and dissensions? Are not her missions generally, at once the pulsation of her common life, and the evidence of the difficulty of establishing real Churches, of forming and training Christian nations, while she is thus insulated and separated, and in such want of ecclesiastical superintendence? And where can this inward evil be more grievous, than in that land, amid that concourse of all opposite forms of Christianity, beside the three Patriarchates, and the Colony of Rabbies, in the presence of the Mosque of Omar, and of the foundations of the Temple of Jerusalem? Does it not seem then to lie in the counsels of God, that in the missions of the Evangelical Church the feeling of the union and connexion of all her members over the whole globe should be kindled? Does it not seem especially at the present moment to be the loving purpose of the Lord of the Church, that in the ancient Land of Promise, on the place of His earthly ministry, not only should Israel be brought to a knowledge of His salvation, but also that the several Evangelical Churches, grounded on the everlasting foundation of the Gospel, and on the rock of faith in the Son of the Living God, should forget their divisions, be reminded of their unity, and stretch out the hand of peace and union to each other over the cradle and grave of the Redeemer? His Majesty on his part will not hesitate on this occasion to hold out his hand trustfully to the Episcopal Church of England, which combines evangelical principles with a historical constitution aiming at universality, and with ecclesiastical independence. His Majesty, in the spirit of apostolical Catholicity, and in the expectation of a like spirit on the part of the English Church, feels no scruple to declare his readiness, in all missionary countries where this Church has an Episcopate, to allow the clergy and missionaries of his national Church to attach themselves thereto, and for this end to obtain episcopal ordination, which the English Church requires for

admission to the ministry. He will take care that this ordination shall always be recognised in his dominions. More especially his Majesty is resolved to do everything in the Holy Land, that can be expected from a Christian King, to facilitate united action in behalf of the Gospel. The English Church is in possession of an ecclesiastical establishment on Mount Zion; and his Majesty holds it to be the duty of all Evangelical Princes and communities to unite themselves to this establishment, as the starting and central point of their combined action. For his Majesty looks upon this as a ground of great hope for the future destinies of Evangelical Christendom. In the first place a visible centre and a living lever will manifestly be obtained thereby for all its missions in the whole compass of the Turkish Empire, and in the original seats of Christianity; and when this lever is once set in motion, its power will soon become felt from Abyssinia even to Armenia. Moreover another object, which in itself is highly desirable and important, will be attained. A neutral Christian region will thus be gained in the simplest manner, removed beyond the confines of narrowing nationalities, where, through the blessing of God, by the common action of faithful love, a progressive union of Evangelical Christians may be prepared more readily than under any other circumstances. Naturally however it cannot be his Majesty's purpose, in such a union, to sacrifice or endanger the independence of the National Church of his own country. According to his Majesty's view, a true living Evangelical exhibition of Catholicity is only conceivable, if the unity is to be grounded on the divinely ordained multiplicity of tongues and nations, with a recognition of the whole individuality and historical development of each nation and country. Every national Church has without doubt, like the people that belongs to it, her own peculiar calling in the great scheme and unfolding of the Kingdom of God. Nay, every narrower, smaller Christian community in a Christian country has no less unquestionably a calling and a duty to seek out a peculiar sphere within the universal Church for those works of love, for which it has received a particular destination and

a particular blessing. Especially his Majesty, as a German Prince, and King of his own country, has the liveliest conviction that the Evangelical Christianity of the German people is called to occupy an independent place in every exhibition of such an Evangelical Apostolical Catholicity, so long as the word of God is preacht in the German language, and His praise is sung in the German tongue. His Majesty lives in the hope that, even in this present century, the position of the Evangelical Church of Germany, as soon as she becomes duly aware of this her calling, will be on a level with the whole spiritual and political position of the people from whom the blessed work of the Reformation issued three hundred years ago. In accordance with these views and convictions, the proposed confidential negotiations with the English Church must be guided by two main principles. The one is the utmost possible unity of action between the two Churches in the Turkish Empire, and especially in the Holy Land: the other must be respect for the independence of the German Evangelical Church, and for the nationality of the German people. The first condition and beginning of this common action, his Majesty conceives, should be, that the English Church should erect a Bishopric of her own at Jerusalem. The foundation for this has already been laid, as it were, by a special interposition. The first results of the Mission to Jerusalem justify the fairest hopes; but its check and present troubled condition seem urgently to call for the establishment of such a Bishopric. Episcopal superintendence and decision on the spot will alone be availing: a government exercised from Malta would not seem to his Majesty either a satisfactory or a truly Apostolic institution. The Bishopric to be erected at Jerusalem would therefore connect itself with the institutions and buildings already begun on Mount Zion, and would comprehend all Evangelical Christians in the Holy Land, who may be willing to take part in it. The generous sentiments which have recently been exprest at a meeting of the friends of the English Church under the presidency of the venerable Archbishop of Canterbury, seem to his Majesty a sure pledge that

so seasonable and purely Christian a purpose as the establishment of permanent Churches in Missionary countries, will in this instance also be carried out worthily."

Such was the proposition which came from the King of Prussia in the summer of 1841, and was laid before the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London. One prompted by a purer spirit of Christian love never proceeded from any soverein. Certain of the theological or ecclesiastical views implied in it may indeed be startling to some, whose own views have been drawn from a different aspect of the Church, and who conceive that what is positive must always be fenced in by a thick palisade of negations: such persons are apt to fume, if any one dares to suppose that different ecclesiastical bodies can exist side by side without falling to loggerheads. On the other hand in our own Statement, published by authority, expressions occur, which might indicate that hostility to the Church of Rome was one of the motives of the institution; and this seems to have alarmed and irritated our hankerers after Popery. But in the King of Prussia's Instructions there is not a word of the sort; and in the further exposition of his views by his Minister it is said (p. 60), that, "as the Evangelical community at Jerusalem is to exercise brotherly love and peace toward the Romish Church, which, like ours, is a stranger there, and to confine herself to the repudiation of usurpations, should any arise, it cannot be her calling to take a polemical position over against the other Churches, which do not assert any claims to dominion over forein bodies." Now what feelings must the receit of such a proposition have excited in the two Bishops? Can any Christian heart do otherwise than rejoice and give thanks to God, for having raised up such a soverein in this perilous crisis of His Church, and admire and love the King, who thus made the glory of God, and the increase of the Church, the first object of his reign? M. Eichhorn indeed, in his official announcement of the measure, spoke also of commercial and scientific advantages to be expected from it. Perhaps he may have thought that a political measure dictated solely by religious motives was

incongruous with the spirit of the age, and have deemed it expedient to propitiate that spirit by urging other motives more congenial to it: perhaps he himself could not enter fully into the King's pure Christian zeal: at all events in the King's Instructions there is no such allusion, nor room for any; nor, if such ends had been contemplated, could there well have been a more round-about mode of compassing them. How then, I ask, were the two Bishops to treat this proposition? Ought they to have rejected it? No one, I believe, has dared to say that. Remorse and shame would have been their portion, had they done so. Yet, be it remembered, this was the state of the case. The impugners of the measure have talkt in solemn phrases about the duty of waiting for God's own time, of not intruding impatiently to hasten the designs of Providence. But what is meant by waiting for God's own time? Does it mean that we are to shut our eyes, and open our mouths, and sit quiet till the cherry drops into them? The King of Prussia saw the purpose of God in the opportunity which was granted to him of acting for the glory of God, and for the good of the Church, and of his own people. Surely this is waiting God's time: we are to wait watching, in order to seize it by the forelock as soon as it comes, not to let it pass by. And did not the measure come to the Bishops almost as a sign from God, commanding them to act for His glory, and for the good of the English, and of the German, yea, of the whole Church? They had not sought it; but it came to them. What sign can there be that God wills we should act, stronger and clearer than when the opportunity and means are placed before us, without any concert, without the slightest anticipation on our part, by a person having full authority to act, manifestly influenced by the desire of God's glory, and calling upon us to join with him in working for it. Moreover the proposition was brought to them just at the time when their hearts were already full of similar schemes, as it were in fulfilment of the promise that to him who has shall be given: for it was soon after the Meeting at which resolutions were past to raise funds for sending Bishops to all our Colonies:

and this determination on our part, which is alluded to in the King's Instructions, may perhaps have helpt in giving shape to his purpose of taking advantage of the state of affairs in the East for the good of the Protestant Churches. The Archbishop too, in the Charge which he had delivered in the previous summer, had exprest his pious longings for the very objects, the opportunity of effecting which was now placed before him. "I would (he there says, p. 32) it were possible to extend this great principle of unity to all the Churches of Christendom. The dissensions which separated the Churches of the East and the West, and the corruptions and intolerance which drove the Protestants from the communion of Rome, have been most injurious to the Catholic Church. A reconciliation would indeed be desirable. But reunion with Rome has been rendered impossible by the sinister policy of the Council of Trent, which, dreading the result of discussion on many disputed points, made no scruple of multiplying articles of faith, which, however erroneous, can never be disclaimed by that Church till she abandons her pretensions to infallibility. Yet I am not without hope that more cordial union may in time be effected among all Protestant Churches; nor do I think it improbable, that the gradual admission of light in the East may improve the condition of those ancient Churches which have groaned so long under the oppression of infidels, may induce them to try their creeds by the standard of Scripture, and dispose them to friendly communications with our own Church." Had the Archbishop been able to look into the King of Prussia's heart, and to discern the purposes which were teeming there, he could scarcely have exprest a more distinct anticipation of the measure in which he was to be invited to cooperate a year after, and which he therefore could hardly fail to regard as a special act of Providence, vouchsafed almost in immediate answer to his prayer. At all events this coincidence between two persons, so differently situated, and yet, from their position, the very two persons on whose concurrent goodwill the accomplishment of the scheme must mainly depend,—their contemporaneous aspirations after

union among the Protestant Churches, and with the Churches of the East, as something not merely desirable, but which the posture of the world seemed to bring within the sphere of practicability,—prove that the measure, which was proposed with such zeal by the one, and accepted with such cordial thankfulness by the other, was in the highest sense seasonable, and in accordance with the signs and with the wants of the times.

It is true, though the King's proposition was substantially so pure and godly, so fitted to awaken joy and thankfulness in every Christian heart, there might still be something in the form of the measure, that should have made the Bishops pause before they adopted it; pause, I say, before they adopted it; not, reject it. For we cannot well be in a position where it becomes our duty to reject a great good; though the general structure of existing forms and circumstances may easily be so far repugnant to that which we are called to incorporate therewith, as to impose the duty of modifying its form to remove or lessen that repugnancy, and to bring it into some sort of harmony with the previous order of things: indeed it is through such a repugnancy that a novelty becomes what is called an innovation. To reject good altogether, because it does not fit at once into the trammels of custom and convention, is the course of a crampt pettifogging formalism, through the noxious influence of which establisht forms so often wane away and stiffen into lifeless skeletons. No great good can come forth, without being at variance with the trammels of custom, without, so to say, breaking the shell. But who would crush the bird, because it breaks its shell? Forms must yield, must expand, must reshape themselves, when new modes of good are rising into outward manifestation. They ought to be clothes, not chains, to be elastic, in recognition that the clothes are made for the man, not the man for the clothes.

The chief objections which have been brought forward against the Jerusalem Bishopric, may be ranged under two heads. One class of them turns upon its alledged incompatibleness with the Canons of our Church; and this has been urged the most prominently by Mr Hope, in a pamphlet written with great ability,

powerful both from his logical dexterity and his legal knowledge, and exemplarily temperate in style. He shews, with a good deal of ingenuity, that our Bishop at Jerusalem cannot perform any act in the way of fulfilling the King of Prussia's purpose,—the special purpose for which his office was instituted,—without violating some one or other of our Canons. He pinions the poor Bishop down with Canons, and manacles him, and fetters him, and then defies him to move, exclaiming that, if he does move, he will break some Canon, and thereby cut himself off from the Church of England. Yet all this rather reminds us of the puzzle, by which a complicated net of packthread is woven round a child's finger, so that it seems bound inextricably, until the child is bid to pull back its finger, which slips through, and the whole net unravels at once. The main difference is, that Mr Hope shews no sign of any like purpose to let his captive escape. Able however as his pamphlet is, it is altogether the work of an advocate; and we know how easy it is for a clever advocate to make out a very plausible, and what to us laymen may seem an incontrovertible case. In fact one may feel confident that this whole argument about the Canons can never have really convinced any one, not even Mr Hope himself. There must needs have been a foregone conclusion, on the strength of which he set himself to draw up as strong a plea as he could; and most of those who adopt his arguments, do so under the influence of a like foregone conclusion. For why? The Canons, on which so much stress is laid, were manifestly never intended for the state of things now in question: they were not framed in the contemplation of any such event as the invitation to establish the Jerusalem Bishopric: consequently, in applying them to it, we must be guided by induction and analogy. They refer entirely to the internal regulation and discipline of our own Church, not to her relations with other Churches. That they were not designed to bear on the latter, is plain, not merely from the absence of all reference thereto in the Canons themselves, but also from the practice of our Church toward forein Protestants during the whole century in the middle of which they were

enacted. It would be interesting and useful, if some person verst in the ecclesiastical literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries would collect the evidence of the relations which then subsisted between our Church and the forein Protestants, as evinced both by the language of our most authoritative writers, and by any ecclesiastical acts of which a record is preserved. I much doubt whether it would be possible to shew that there was at any time a distinct, deliberate purpose of excluding them from our communion; and there would be an abundance of proofs that practically they were not excluded. Even the Romanists, though we regarded them, and not without ample cause, as the enemies of our Church, were not excommunicated by us, but by their own act and deed; and surely we did not use a harsher measure toward those whom we lookt upon as our friends, united to us in the same great cause of upholding the truth of the Gospel and the pure worship of God. The fact, to which Mr Hope alludes, that the Lutherans had a separate place of worship even in the reign of Elizabeth, did not arise from their being precluded from joining in our worship: it was a privilege granted to them, in that they were allowed to celebrate divine worship in their own language, and in the form to which they had been accustomed; just as our refugees were at Frankfort in the reign of Mary. Nor is there more force in the argument which Mr Hope (p.15) founds on the clause in the Act of the 12th and 13th of William the 3d *for the Limitation of the Crown*, that "whosoever shall come to the possession of this crown shall *join in communion* with the Church of England." On the strength of these words Mr Hope maintains, that "Protestantism, which qualifies for the succession to the English Crown (such as Lutheranism), does not imply communion with the English Church; for this is to be obtained by a separate act; and this act, let me add, must be according to the laws of the Church of England." Now surely these conclusions shoot far beyond the mark. The first legitimate inference from this provision concerning the succession is, that the Church of England was regarded by the Legislature and by the Nation as a Protestant

Church, and the Reformed Churches on the Continent as sister Churches, not indeed as identically the same with our National Church,—this is inconsistent with the very idea of a National Church,—but as sister branches of the Universal Church. Next, as the specific proviso was manifestly introduced in anticipation of the Hanoverian succession, it does indeed imply that the Electors of Hanover were not in actual communion with the Church of England; which, having spent all their lives in Germany, they could not be. But it no way implies that they were not regarded as admissible to the communion of our Church; rather does it imply the very contrary: for the act whereby they were to *join in that communion* was assuredly nothing more than coming to the Lord's Table to receive it. Mr Hope indeed, after saying that they were to "obtain this communion by a separate act,—and that this act was to be according to the laws of the Church of England," explains his meaning by applying the injunctions of the Rubrics and Canons to all foreiners, insisting that, they must "be instructed in the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Church Catechism, and are then to be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed; after which, and upon conformity to the Liturgy, they may—be admitted to the Holy Communion." Yet it is hard to believe that so intelligent a person could gravely intend to assert, it was the intention of our Legislature to require that the Elector of Hanover, on coming over to England, should say the Catechism to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and should then seek confirmation at his hands, thereby repudiating and stigmatizing all the ordinances of his own Church as invalid, his baptism perhaps excepted, the validity of which Mr Hope seems to recognise, in p. 20. Still less can we believe him to suppose that our first two Georges did actually go through this process; though, unless this was his meaning, his fact contradicts his argument. At all events, however strong his own persuasion may be that such was the case, he will scarcely induce any sober-minded person to adopt that persuasion, unless he can cite some historical evidence of this most apocryphal fact. Till such

evidence is laid before us, the reasonable part of the world will rather assume that, as I said above, the act whereby the Electors of Hanover joined in the communion of our Church, was by presenting themselves at the Lord's Table. Nay, although, when the King of Prussia came over to England as Sponsor to the Prince of Wales, a person was found simple-hearted enough to exhort him to qualify himself for that office by submitting to be confirmed anew by one of our Bishops, without bethinking himself of the ferment and indignation which such an act must have caused in every Protestant congregation in his dominions, I can hardly believe that, even from among the Nonjurors, any person can have come with such a proposition to George the First. But further, can any single instance be adduced, in which an adult member of the Lutheran Church has been required to be confirmed anew, before he could be admitted to the Lord's Table? We may presume that there can hardly be such an instance; for, had one been discoverable, Mr Hope would have cited it, and his party would have dinned it in our ears. On the other hand numberless instances must have occurred, during the three centuries since the Reformation, of forein Protestants admitted to communion in our Church without any such requirement; and this has been done repeatedly by the first dignitaries of our Church. Besides a great number of forein Protestants have been ordained to our Ministry, especially as missionaries; and even on these solemn occasions they have not had to go through those preparatory steps, which Mr Hope pronounces to be indispensable before they can be admitted to our communion? Mr Hope indeed would fain evade this difficulty by asserting, in p. 14, that this has never been done, "except through the irregular conduct of individuals:" but when that which he calls "the irregular conduct of individuals," has been the uniform practice in our Church for three centuries, sanctioned over and over again by Primate after Primate, we shall hardly feel warranted in condemning that practice, because it is at variance with a most questionable interpretation of Rubrics and Canons drawn up

two or three centuries ago, an interpretation directly repugnant to the principles of our 34th Article, which recognises the authority of "every particular or national Church to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites." For surely this recognition admits that, notwithstanding the diversity of ceremonies and rites, Churches may be in communion with each other; whereas Mr Hope's argument is, that no Church can be in communion with ours, unless it adopts the same rites and ceremonies. Every lawyer knows what great weight is attacht to the decisions of our Judges in the interpretation of our Common and Statute Law: and somewhat similar to this must be the authority of the uniform unreproved practice of our Bishops in the interpretation of our Ecclesiastical Law; the need of which authority for such a purpose must be the greater, because our Canons were enacted so long since, under a very different state of things, as Mr Hope himself urges with much force in p. 60; and there has been no legitimate authority to modify and adapt them to the different wants of our age.

Hence we may judge what importance is due to Mr Hope's elaborate attempt to make out, that, if our Bishop at Jerusalem does not strictly enforce these Canons in his dealings with the foreiners who may wish to place themselves under his spiritual jurisdiction,—in other words, if he does not wholly nullify the very design for which the Bishopric was primarily establisht,—he will be guilty of perjury. Were it not deemed the business of an advocate to bring forward every argument by which he can gain the slightest shadow of support for his cause, Mr Hope would hardly have thought of devising a grave charge of perjury against a person in the very peculiar position of our Bishop at Jerusalem, if he should not conform to our Canons,—*a yoke which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear*,—Canons which are continually violated in divers ways by every minister of our Church from the Primate down to the Deacons ordained in the last Ember-week, and which have been repeatedly violated, one need not hesitate to say, by every minister of our Church during the last hundred years. In a Court of Conscience assuredly the

Bishop might reply to any clergyman who dared to insinuate such a charge, *He that is without sin amongst you, let him cast the first stone at me:* and when considering the matter before the more solemn tribunal within his own breast, he will probably come to the conclusion, that, if he observes our Canons as they have been observed by the body of our Bishops for the last two centuries, having respect at the same time to his peculiar circumstances, and the distinctive purpose of his mission, he will do what is right before God. In conformity to the common practice of the most conscientious persons with regard to disciplinary rules and statutes, transmitted, without adaptation to existing circumstances, from a bygone age, he will interpret his obligation by the help of usage, and, should any novel case arise, by the judgement of those who, even if they have not the power of dispensing with the rules, or remodeling them, must be taken, in the present state of things, as their authoritative expounders.

In fact Mr Hope himself is well aware of this. What he says about perjury is manifestly little else than a *brutum fulmen*. He feels that the stress of the question lies elsewhere. Therefore he taxes all his ingenuity to prove that our Bishopric at Jerusalem is in all material respects exactly similar to any other See of our Church, and that it does not involve any peculiar relations with forein Protestants. Now this was no easy matter, seeing that the new Bishopric was no spontaneous creation of the English Church, but was originally suggested and prompted by the King of Prussia, and was avowedly erected by our Church in some sort of cooperation with him; seeing too that the essential feature in his plan was the establishment of a peculiar relation between our Church and his in the East. But Mr Hope, rightly laying down that Prussian Statepapers can have no authority with our Church, proceeds somewhat hastily to push aside the Prussian official documents altogether, which, at the time when he wrote, alone gave anything like a full account of the objects of the new measure; and, in determining the character of that measure, he confines himself wholly to the very scanty information which had then been supplied by our Government civil and spiritual. Of

this far the most important part at that time was the Act of Parliament, which gave authority for the consecration of the New Bishop, and which, in speaking of his jurisdiction, enacts, that he may exercise "spiritual jurisdiction over the ministers of British congregations,—*and over such other Protestant congregations* as may be desirous of placing themselves under his authority." To evade the force of these words, Mr Hope asks (p. 22), "whether every English Bishop has not the same power over every Protestant congregation which is willing to place itself under him," by adopting our Liturgy, and being incorporated into our Church. Hence he contends that this is the only way in which forein Protestants can place themselves under the spiritual jurisdiction of our Bishop at Jerusalem: they must be received into our Church one by one, and they must adopt our Liturgy. This interpretation he tries to confirm by the Report of what the Archbishop of Canterbury said, on moving the third reading of the Bill,—a Report which occupies just ten lines of his pamphlet,—and by divers processes of logical induction. Now, had it so happened that Mr Hope had come forward to maintain the opposite side, it would have been pleasant to see how ingeniously he would have exposed the fallacies in his own argument. He would of course have remarkt that the speeches on Bills, which do not excite any lively interest in Parliament, are hardly ever reported so as to convey any notion of their contents, and that, unless the Archbishop had invented some new machine for the condensation of thought, he could never have explained the purpose and bearings of such a complicated measure as the Jerusalem Bishopric in the space of ten lines, which in fact state little else than that the Bill had received the sanction of the civil Government. Surely too Mr Hope would have urged that, if there are two ways of interpreting the same words, — one, and that the most palpable, which gives them a definite meaning, and another according to which they are mere surplusage,—the former is to be preferred, even in the construction of an Act of Parliament, at least of those parts of it which set forth the specific purposes of the Act. Again, if Mr Hope's vigilance had not been exhausted in his exertions to

make out a plausible case from such scanty and reluctant materials, he could not have failed to perceive that, while he maintains (in p. 20) that the German Protestants who "desire to be admitted to communion, must come, not as a body, but as individuals, not asserting an independent collective existence, but desiring to be adopted by and incorporated into the Church," the words of the Act, empowering the Bishop to exercise spiritual jurisdiction "over such *Protestant Congregations* as may be desirous of placing themselves under his authority," manifestly imply the reverse, that the Protestants are to come, *not as individuals, but as a body*, and to continue *as a body* under the Bishop's spiritual jurisdiction. For the spiritual jurisdiction exercised over the Protestant congregations is plainly not to be a momentary act, confined to the transfer of them from their own Church into ours, but a continuous course of action: and Mr Hope, after putting the alternative, that this spiritual jurisdiction must either be exercised by admitting them to communion, or else, if they are not in communion, "by declaring them formally excommunicate" (p. 23), himself rejects the latter supposition, and adopts the former, on account of certain expressions used in the first public notice which was given to our Church of the intention to erect a Bishopric at Jerusalem. Moreover, if there had been no special prepossessions to obscure Mr Hope's view, he would doubtless have discerned, that, though the Prussian official documents are not the proper source from which our Church is to draw her knowledge of the character and objects of the new institution, yet, seeing that it is acknowledged on all hands to be the result of a negociation and compact with the King of Prussia, the interpretation put upon the measure by the Prussian Government must needs be a material element for determining its real nature; so long at least as we are left without some authoritative declaration to the contrary. In truth, if the Bishopric which the English Government and the two Prelates of our Church intended to establish at Jerusalem, was designed by them to be nothing else than what Mr Hope asserts the Jerusalem Bishopric to be, I know not how it would be possible to acquit them of having

practist a scandalous fraud on the King of Prussia, who, it is clear, had acted throughout in godly simplicity and good faith; a fraud which, in ordinary life, would be termed a shameful piece of swindling, and might probably be punisht by transportation; and which, "considering (as Mr. Hope says in p. 27) the special responsibility of a Bishop, I, for my own part, do not know how to qualify by any lighter name." Thus the conclusion to which Mr Hope gets at the end of his pamphlet, and which he proclaims with a sort of triumph, that his arguments "go to the entire destruction of the theory propounded in the Prussian document" (p. 36), and "exclude Prussian Protestants as a formal collective body from our Bishop's communion at Jerusalem" (p. 38), would at all events, if tenable, place our Prelates in this happy dilemma, that either they had wittingly been guilty of gross swindling in their dealings with the King of Prussia, or else that their conduct had been markt with such imbecillity, that, while intending to effect a certain measure in conformity to a solemn engagement, they had so contrived the measure as wholly to violate that engagement. Were it not that common honesty is so often left out of account by zealots in ecclesiastical and religious controversies, as a vulgar thing unworthy of notice by those who are contesting about Canons and Rubrics, one should be surprised that an able and honorable man should acquiesce self-complacently in having brought his argument to an issue, by which at all events the King of Prussia was to be defrauded, whether our Bishops did it willingly, or through blundering stupidity.

In his original pamphlet Mr Hope seems rather to propend to the former of these alternatives. At least the main object of that pamphlet was to shew that nothing had been done in the establishment of the new Bishopric to fulfill the expectation excited in the Prussian Government by the negociation with our Prelates; though their first brief announcement of the scheme had distinctly declared their intention of fulfilling it. In the Postscript to his second edition however Mr Hope is forced to admit (p. 48), that "the Prussian Document is supported and confirmed in all material points" by the authoritative Statement which our Prelates

had then put forth. Hereupon one might have thought he would have abandoned his position. But no: arguments and facts are equally unavailing to shake a resolute man's conviction. Even when you fancy you have not left him a leg to stand on, he will fight, like Witherington, on his stumps. In the Statement it is naturally laid down that the new Bishop's jurisdiction is to be "*exercised, as nearly as may be, according to the laws, canons, and customs of the Church of England.*" The rest of the Statement confirms the Prussian view of the case, and contradicts Mr Hope's: at the sight of this clause however he revives. Our Bishop at Jerusalem seemed to have got free from the ties which had been fashioned so dexterously to keep him motionless: but here is a prospect of slipping the strait waistcoat upon him again, with fresh unlookt for bandages. The statement not only subjects the new Bishop to the "*canons*," but also to the "*laws and customs*" of the Church of England; which words, Mr. Hope presumes, "include the Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy, Cawdry's Case, Viner's Abridgement, tit. Prohibition, Comyns's Digest, tit. Prerogative, *et hoc genus omne*." What is the poor Bishop to do? Must he not resign himself to his fate? What would even Boniface have done, had he gone to Germany thus gagged and handcuft? or Augustin, had he come thus to England? Happily however there is still an escape. That little clause, *as nearly as may be*, enables him to slip out of this strait waistcoat, as he had out of the previous net. These words shew, that, in carrying out the great objects of his mission, as set forth in the rest of the Statement, he is to be guided, as far as may be consistent with their due execution, by the Canons, laws, and customs of our Church, not however to let the observance of those Canons and laws defeat the very work for which he was especially appointed.

A short time after the publication of Mr Hope's second Edition, the Archbishop of Canterbury's Letter to the King of Prussia explicitly stated that the congregations of German Protestants under our Bishop at Jerusalem are to use a German Liturgy, taken from Liturgies used in Prussia, and that the candidates for holy orders, after having satisfied the Bishop as to their competency

and their soundness in the faith, are to be ordained on signing the three Creeds. I know not whether Mr Hope has ever drawn up a proof how this Letter still further confirms his whole view of the character of the Bishopric: but even Witherington, even Cynegirus, at last could not hold out longer. The rule with regard to ordination may indeed be termed a bold step: and so it certainly is in days when a stiff and narrow formalism has been lifting up its head again: but it is all the more honorable on this account to those who had the courage to take it: and, while it is the legitimate consequence of the whole previous proceedings, it lays down, for the first time in these modern ages, what is the true ground of Christian Communion.

I have engaged in this long examination of Mr Hope's pamphlet, because, while it certainly is very able and plausible, it is held up by the opponents of the Jerusalem Bishopric as unanswered and unanswerable. Yet answered it was at the time, and refuted in its main positions, most completely and triumphantly, as were also the other chief objections to the Bishopric, by the dear friend, who has since become my brother, in his *Letters to the Rev. W. Palmer*, and the Appendixes subjoined to them. In going over the same ground, I have had to use many of the same arguments; and I have thought it advisable to enter more into details, because many persons are readily imposed upon by a show of technical precision, as though, when a lawyer fortifies himself with cases and Canons, his position must needs be impregnable. Thus much Mr Hope has certainly establisht, that, if the whole body of our Canons and Rubrics are to be set up as our terms of communion with forein Churches, no member of any Church, except our own, can ever be admitted to our communion: and we may wish this distinguisht champion of Catholic truth joy of such a discovery: we here see what the most enlarged mind may become under the bondage of ordinances; we see to what slavery the Canonists, if they were allowed to have their way, would bring us. But he has not shewn,—on the contrary he has entirely past over the previous question,—whether the whole body of our Canons and Rubrics were ever designed by our Church

to be her terms of communion with forein Churches; and our unvarying practice since the Reformation, it seems to me, supported by the express declaration of our 34th Article, constrains us to conclude that they were not. On certain other technical difficulties, which were mooted against the institution of the new Bishopric, such as the sending of a Bishop into the see of another, and the establishment of a Bishopric of our Church on territory not subject to the English Crown, Mr Hope's decision is very satisfactory. In the present condition of the world and of the Church, divided as nations and Churches are, by languages, institutions, habits, modes of thought and feeling, the growth of many centuries, during which each nation and Church has been unfolding itself after its kind, it is plain that a rule, which belonged to and presupposed a wholly different state of things, is become inapplicable. It is neither practicable, nor desirable, that the members of our Church, who are residing in the south of Europe, or in Asia Minor and Syria and Egypt, should conform to the dominant Churches in those parts: and as the numbers of English living abroad are continually increasing through the ever increasing facilities of traveling, it becomes more and more the duty of our Church to provide pastoral care for her children in forein lands: nor should her pastors abroad be left without episcopal superintendence. It is also satisfactory to read Mr Hope's recognition (p. 34), that, as "the Crown alone, or the Crown empowered by Parliament, has since the Reformation exercised the prerogative (of erecting new sees) within the British dominions,"—as "it is by the Crown alone that many of our Colonial Bishoprics have been erected,"—and as, "in the erection of Bishop Alexander's see, the act of the Crown has been sanctioned by Parliament," and, "the Primate of the Church of England also concurred in the measure,"—"it may safely be asserted, that in all formal respects the Anglican See of Jerusalem has been as solemnly erected as any of our modern Bishoprics." Whether the opponents of the Bishopric will be equally satisfied with the quandary in which he leaves them, I know not. He suggests the means whereby they may attempt to repudiate what they may

deem irregular acts committed by the Bishop in his dealings with the forein Protestants under his spiritual jurisdiction; "by raising the question formally in the Ecclesiastical Court of Canterbury, or before the Archbishop in person (p. 36)."

On the questions of principle, which have been the real ground of the vehement opposition to the Jerusalem Bishopric, Mr Hope scarcely touches; nor need I dwell long upon them. For they are continually coming forward in one shape or other in the ecclesiastical controversies of the day. As is mostly the case indeed, when parties grow heated, sundry misapprehensions arose, and added fresh fuel to the hostility: and the true source of the opposition was so palpably adverse to the spirit which has uniformly prevailed in our Church, from the Reformation down to our days, that whatever might furnish a plea for caviling was sedulously scraped together. The measure was supposed by some to have been dictated by a spirit of hostility to Rome; but for this notion, as we have seen above, there was not the slightest warrant. Others complained that we were going to disturb the tranquillity of the Greek Church. But the desire and purpose of the King of Prussia, we have seen, as well as of our own Prelates, was to make the new Bishopric the medium of a friendly intercourse with the Eastern Churches, especially with the Greek; not indeed without a hope of helping thereby to promote the spiritual welfare of the Greek Church: such a wish however, if it do not vent itself insolently or indiscreetly, is not very reprehensible. Surely too, if, as is alledged, our ministers and missionaries in Syria and Asia Minor are often apt to make predatory incursions into the territory of the Greek Church, the proper way of checking this tendency, and of restoring the spirit which ought to prevail between sister Churches, must be by setting a Bishop over our missionaries, specially charged to maintain amicable relations with the ancient Christians of the East. Doubtless in so doing he will have various difficulties to encounter: this however merely proves the need of the office, and of a man gifted with spiritual wisdom to fill it. Another alarm has been got up about our relations with the other Eastern Churches. Mr Hope here comes forward with

his law, and pronounces (p. 6) that "bodies holding any doctrine condemned by the first four general Councils are, in our law, heretical; and an English Bishop will of course take care that he does not involve himself in their guilt." Of course he will. On this legal axiom, though the discussion is not suited to this place, I cannot, with all deference to Mr Hope's superior knowledge, refrain from expressing a doubt. For, though the Act of Elizabeth, in narrowing the bounds of heresy, as an offense cognisable by our courts, enacts that nothing shall be adjudged to be heresy, unless it had been adjudged to be heresy by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or by some of the first four General Councils, the proposition, that nothing else shall be adjudged to be heresy, is not convertible into this, that whatever those Councils condemned shall be adjudged to be heresy. As to the dread lest our Bishop should be implicated in the guilt of these heresies, it is almost amusing. Surely, if there be any place where the members of our Church are likely to be led astray by insidious heresies, this is the very place to which we ought to send a wise Bishop to watch over them. Or do those who are so fond of magnifying the episcopal office, mean that our Bishops are to lie in lavender, and that they must not venture into any spot where their lawn sleeves may run the risk of being soiled? This is not their meaning, I know; but they take up any argument to serve their turn. Even Dr. Pusey, in his *Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury* (p. 121), ejaculates, "Your Grace will readily feel how shocking it would be to be thus brought close within the touch of heresy." Alas! there are still remnants of that spirit which made it a matter of wonder that a Jew should ask water of a woman of Samaria; of that pharisaical pride which cries *Stand off, thou heretic! and dare not come near to an orthodox believer*. Here I will insert an extract from the Prussian Minister's Exposition of his Royal Master's views; and the reader may judge on which side the spirit of Christ is to be found, whether among the enemies or among the establishers of the Jerusalem Bishopric. "As the true Church of the East, the Bishop is to regard the Greek Church, which agrees with the

West in receiving the decrees of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and consequently in the dogmatical development of the doctrine concerning the person of Christ. From her the Nestorian and Monophysite Churches,—one might say, the whole countries in which these views have grown up,—have cut themselves off. The Nestorian view was rejected by the Church, because in the too distinct separation of the Divine and Human nature in Christ lay the danger of losing the living unity of His Person. On the other hand the Monophysites, by confounding the two, and looking not merely for the unity of Person, but for a unity of Nature in Christ, were exposed to the risk of rejecting the reality of His Divinity and Humanity. Now indistinct as may be the persuasion which the present members of these sects may possess with regard to the deeper grounds of this controversy, and to the true meaning of the contested expressions and formulas, which do not properly belong to the province of Christian faith, but of Christian philosophy; yet we cannot relinquish our persuasion, or give up the grounds which the Church gained in that controversy for the doctrine of the Person of Christ; nor can we pronounce the development of that doctrine from those grounds in the whole Western Church to be a matter of indifference. Still we need not on this account attach an inordinate value to abstract philosophico-theological definitions, or allow ourselves to be hindered in the least thereby from a friendly intercourse with those Churches. We do not condemn them; but hitherto the Monophysites at least condemn us and our doctrine, though the Armenians at Constantinople are recently said to have made a cheering exception thereto. By a friendly intercourse, without controversy, we may hope in time to bring about an understanding on these most important dogmatical questions. Then at length may the nations, which are at present Monophysite or Nestorian, occupy their right position, namely that of particular national Churches, with important national peculiarities, and perhaps with certain divergences in minuter points of dogmatical theology, but still with the consciousness of an essential unity in faith, and in the leading articles of doctrine."

The real cause however why the Jerusalem Bishopric has been

attackt so violently and pertinaciously, is, that by it we were to be brought into closer connexion with the German Protestants. Now the prospect of such a connexion would in any previous age have been hailed with delight and thankfulness, not merely by one party in our Church, but by all. For to all the members of our Church the name of Protestant was for centuries a matter of glory; and we felt that we were bound by sacred ties to all who bore it. Both politically and ecclesiastically the English nation and Church regarded themselves as intimately united to every Protestant body, and as the appointed champions of the Protestant cause. Elizabeth and Cromwell and William the Third were so indeed more energetically and heartily, according to the vigour and greatness of their characters; but the first two Stuarts also, after the measure of their feebleness, recognised that this is the duty of England. Only in the disgraceful reigns of the latter Stuarts were any doubts on the subject entertained at Court; and the doubts of the Court were not shared by the nation, but stirred up the nation against the Court, until at length it shook off the ignominious yoke of treachery and falsehood. In the Notes on the Sermons subjoined to *the Mission of the Comforter* (pp. 1006, 1007), I have cited a few passages in proof that our brotherhood with the Protestant Churches on the Continent was affectionately recognized, not by Low-Churchmen and Puritans, but by the very persons whom our modern Romanizers used to hold up as the exemplars of English Churchmen, by Archbishop Sancroft, and by the Lower House of Convocation in 1689 and in 1705. In the latter year the Lower House, speaking on a project closely akin to that which we are discussing,—the plan of introducing the English Liturgy, and Episcopacy by means of English Ordinations, into Prussia,—say that they cannot "omit taking notice of *the present endeavours of several Reformed Churches to accommodate themselves to our Liturgy and Constitution.*—They are very desirous of knowing in what manner it may be proper for this Convocation,—*to express their great satisfaction to find in them such good dispositions, and their readiness to maintain and cherish such a fraternal correspondence with them, as may strengthen the interest of the*

Reformed Religion against the common enemy." (See Cardwell's *Synodalia*, p. 722.) The evidence which I have adduced of this state of feeling might easily be decupled or centupled, were there need. In fact the difficulty would be to bring forward any evidence of opposite views and feelings, as entertained by any of our divines of the slightest eminence, previous to the recent insurrection of Romish principles in the heart of our Church. That a like spirit still prevailed among the most soberminded and judicious down to our days, is proved by the loving wish for "a more cordial union among all Protestant Churches" exprest in the Charge quoted above, in p. 76. Nay, surely heinous guilt would be incurred by those, who, asserting that Episcopacy is indispensable to the existence of a Church, and to the ministration of sacramental grace, and that they who are without it have no share in Christ's redemption, would yet wantonly withhold that ordinance, where they have the means of bestowing it: only they do not really believe what they say: their opinions do not form part of a coherent system, but are pickt up as they are driven and tost about by the impulses of party-spirit.

Thus the measure proposed by the King of Prussia, so far as it was designed to lead to a closer union of the Protestant Churches, was no way repugnant to the traditional feelings and notions of the English Church, but was such as would in all ages have been welcomed with joy by the lovers of our Church, more especially by those who most prized her distinctive form of government and discipline. The Charge too, which I quoted above, further proves, that those who from their position may be expected to speak the mind of the English Church in our own days, as throughout her history since the Reformation, regard her as a Protestant Church, and regard the other communities of Christians, who were severed from the Romish Church at the Reformation, as Protestant Churches. For in expressing his wish "for a more cordial union among all Protestant Churches," which title evidently includes our own, it is plain that the Archbishop was not using any novel language, or asserting anything which he supposed to be questionable, but merely speaking as he conceived all his predecessors would have

spoken, from Archbishop Parker downwards. So alien is the mind of the English Church from that newfangled upstart heresy which disclaims the name of Protestant, and audaciously denies the name of Church to the German Lutherans. In fact, even among the victims of that heresy, among its chief promulgators, are persons, who, not twenty years ago, joined in expelling Sir Robert Peel from the representation of Oxford, because, as they asserted, he had betrayed the Protestant cause. So late too as 1837, Mr Newman, in the Advertisement prefixt to his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, said: "Viewed politically, Protestantism is at this day the rallying point of all that is loyal and highminded in the nation."

A few years ago it would have been a waste of words to cite evidence for the sake of proving what everybody then well knew to be the fact. But in the giddy whirl of our age, when opinions too are traveling at railway speed, people are apt to forget to-day what they themselves and all the world thought yesterday: and sometimes they will kick away their cast off opinions, and trample upon them, and protest that no rational being can ever have held anything so absurd. A year or two after Mr Newman had spoken thus of Protestantism, a cry was set up against Protestantism by persons so learned in the history of the Church, that they drew their notion of Protestantism from the orators in Exeter Hall. At first indeed the object of attack was what was called Ultra-Protestantism: but ere long it was assumed that Ultra-Protestantism and Protestantism are identical; though the very difference in the names is a mark that there must be an essential difference in the things designated by them; and though it is notorious that the evils which are found to result from a principle carried to excess, no way prove that the principle in itself is evil, but often bear witness of its power for good. Under the influence of this delusion, when it was known that the proposition for the establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric had been laid before our Prelates, and had been favorably entertained by them, the measure was denounced as alien to the principles of the Anglican Church, involving her in a connexion with Protestantism, and branding her with the stigma

of being a Protestant body. Of the most virulent of these railers, who condemned the Prussian Church on the score of what he had seen and heard among the Protestants in France, and the Evangelical dissidents at Geneva, and of other evidence equally relevant, scarcely a particle of it bearing in any way even on the state of religion in Prussia,—and who poured out vollies of anathemas with a spirit like that of an angry boy throwing stones,—there is no need to speak. He received his *quietus*, and will only be remembered through the Reply which he called forth. But there was another opponent, whose name and previous life rendered him far more formidable, and whose first theological work had been an Apology for the German Church, remarkable, among the writings of English divines, for its laborious learning and thoughtful candour. Dr Pusey has indeed recently retracted a large part of the opinions exprest in his Answers to Mr Rose: he does not inform us however by what force of reasoning he felt himself constrained to abandon conclusions, at which he had arrived by a long and elaborate research carried on with conscientious diligence for a series of years. He pleads that on certain points he wrote in ignorance: yet his earlier writings on German theology evince a large amount of learning, and of accurate discriminating investigation; whereas the judgements which he has recently pronounced on the same subject, have mostly been unsupported assertions. Instead of being anxious, as formerly, that English readers should understand the growth and real purport of that which they are called upon to condemn, he has appealed to their blind prejudices for the sake of obtaining a verdict. A full exposure of the misrepresentations contained in his *Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury*, where he introduces a long attack on the Prussian Church, for the sake of averting the establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric, would require a much longer discussion than I can allow myself to insert in this Note. Nor ought such a refutation to be wanted, inasmuch as the work has already been performed thoroughly, in a pamphlet written with admirable mildness and candour, by a person possessing every requisite for such a task, M. Abeken. Still, as the reply of an unknown foreiner

has a poor chance of weighing in England, or at least with a very large body of our Church, against the statements of the head of a party, like Dr Pusey, the graces of whose character in other respects obtain a credit for him, such as neither his arguments nor his assertions deserve, — and as Dr Pusey himself has not scrupled to republish his statements with scarcely a correction, notwithstanding the full exhibition of their erroneousness by M. Abeken, so that his picture of the Prussian Church is doubtless still regarded by numbers as correct and faithful,—I feel bound to shew again how perverted and false it is.

The principal points in Dr Pusey's invective against the German Church are summed up in an elaborate cumulative sentence, constructed with a good deal of rhetorical skill, where, contending against the hope entertained that a beneficial effect might be produced upon the Churches of the East by the spectacle of a united Church, pure in doctrine and practice, he says that he cannot see "how the picture of a united Church could be presented by an English and Lutheran congregation, of which the one holds 'One Holy Catholic Church, throughout all the world,' knit together by its Bishops, as 'joints and bands,' under its One Head, Christ, and joined on by unbroken succession to the Apostles; the other, an indefinite number of Churches, hanging together by an agreement in a scheme of doctrine framed by themselves, and modified by the civil power: of which the one holds Confirmation to be the act of the Bishop, the other deems such unnecessary, but accepts it for its younger members: the one holds Ordination to be derived from the Apostles; the other, that Presbyters, uncommissioned, may confer it, and that those on whom it has been so conferred, may consecrate the Holy Eucharist: the one recites the Creed of Nicaea, the other has laid it aside: in the one, ancient prayer, the inspired Psalms, and hearing God's Word, are the chief part of their weekly service; in the other, uninspired hymns and preaching with prayer extempore; the one kneel in prayer, the other not even at the Holy Eucharist: with the one, the Lord's Day

is a Holy Day, with the other a holyday: the one receives 'the Faith' as 'once for all delivered to the saints;' the other, as susceptible of subsequent correction and development: the one rests her authority and the very titles of her existence on being an Ancient Church, the other boasts itself Modern: the one, not founded by man, but descended of that founded on the day of Pentecost; the other dating itself truly from Luther, and claiming to be the parent of all, not in outward communion with the Great Eastern and Western Branches, and so of our own Church by whom it was originally converted: the one recognises and has been recognised by the Ancient Church of the East, the other rejects her and is anathematized by her."

On reading over this extraordinary sentence, one cannot but be struck by the enormous importance attacht in it to things secondary and no way essential. A number of ritual and ceremonial differences are strung together for the sake of averting a measure designed to promote Unity in the Church, under the notion that these differences are inimical to, and almost incompatible with Unity. Now which body of practices may in itself be the more appropriate manifestation of a Christian spirit, is another question: the members of each Church will doubtless prefer those they are familiar with, the power of habit in such things being almost absolute. But to lay great stress on these matters as obstacles to a union between different Churches, is a fresh proof how the minds of our English divines have been narrowed and crampt by the miserable hankering after Uniformity. Although our Reformers had so wisely laid down in the 34th Article, that "it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word,"—and although it is equally clear upon historical and upon philosophical grounds that this is the only tenable principle, demonstrated likewise to be so by the voice of Christian love, and by the express precepts of the New Testament, — that stiff

imperious self-will, which is one of the chief diseases of the English character, is prone to demand that all mankind shall dress themselves after our pattern. A few years back we used to fancy that the forms of our Constitution were the panacea for all political evils; and we imposed them upon countries wholly unfit to receive them. Experience of the results of this folly has latterly somewhat abated it; but a still more mischievous one has been thrusting itself forward, insisting that the adoption of our ecclesiastical forms is essential to Christianity. Now certainly Dr Pusey is so far right, that, where such a spirit is prevalent, it would be impossible to exhibit a spectacle of Unity, along with diversities of practice. But is it quite unwarrantable to hope that Christian love may be sufficiently powerful to preserve Unity, amid, and notwithstanding such diversities? Surely we may be one in our One Lord, although some of us pray to the Father through Him on their knees, others standing. Yea, we may be one, through the Communion of His Holy Body, even with those who may receive that Body standing: else how can we be one with the company of the Apostles, who doubtless were sitting, or rather lying round the table, when they received it at its first divine institution? Assuredly too it would be a truly edifying picture of a united Church, if we were to present ourselves as one, notwithstanding all such varieties of form and usage; a picture such as the Church has rarely exhibited in the course of eighteen centuries: so mighty has that carnal spirit been within her, which, the Apostle tells us, is the source of *strife and divisions*. This would not be *agreeing to differ* as the phrase is,—an expression which, in a certain sense, implies a reprehensible carelessness about the truth,—but agreeing in spite of differences. We may agree, and be conscious of our agreement, of our unity, in that which is essential and fundamental, and may resolve that this inward consciousness and the outward manifestation of our essential agreement and unity shall not be destroyed or shaken, even though there be a number of differences amongst us with regard to secondary matters: we may resolve that the sense of these

differences shall not separate us, or set us at variance. We may do this under the conviction of our mutual fallibility, and of the infirmity of our nature, even though the differences relate to truths with regard to which the right view must needs be one. For in such cases differences, when the result of sincere convictions, even among individuals, much more if held by bodies of men through generations, are oftener apparent repugnances between partial apprehensions of the truth, which we perceive from different aspects, and approach from different sides, than anything like an absolute opposition between truth and falsehood: and we may humbly trust that, if we walk according to what we have received, in the spirit of love, exhorting one another, and at the same time forbearing one another, God will reveal that to us, which we may not as yet have discerned. On the other hand, when the differences are outward, and pertain to that which is ritual and ceremonial, it behoves us to bear in mind, that, of outward things, hardly any is in itself right or wrong, or imperatively binding upon all men; none in fact, unless there be an express divine command bearing immediately and unequivocally upon it. Custom indeed will often stamp a moral character on that, which in itself has none; and in so doing its procedure will be very variable, and may not seldom seem arbitrary and capricious: yet, when such associations have long been establisht, the unreflecting, who have grown up under their influence, are apt to regard them as a necessary part of the order of nature. Thus to us it appears an indispensable mark of reverence to uncover our heads on entering a holy place; and we should be shockt to see a man keep his head covered, and begin pulling off his boots or shoes. In Eastern nations on the other hand the practice for more than three thousand years has been that which we should condemn; and to them our behaviour seems strangely indecorous. Each thinks himself right; and so he is, if the outward act is not a mere empty form, but the symbol of a living feeling. Yet it no way follows from our being right, that they who differ from us are not just as right; though our proneness to confound

the form with the substance is ever leading us to pronounce that they cannot be so. These prejudices no wise man will wantonly defy or irritate, though he will desire to moderate them, and to place them on their right footing; even as St Paul did, readily conforming to every lawful institution, yet continually teaching that no such can have any absolute inherent value. Now among the consequences of that fusion of nations, which is every year increasing, and seems likely to increase without limit, from the operation of sundry causes connected with a high state of civilization, one is, that diverse customs are perpetually brought into juxtaposition, and set to confront one another. Hence it is a lesson, which we have a special call to learn in these days, that we have no more warrant to take offense at customs, however different from our own, unless indeed there be a positive taint of moral evil in them, than we have to quarrel with the inhabitants of other countries for not speaking our language. Their customs are, like their language, the symbols of their traditionary thoughts and feelings, and, if worse than ours in some respects, will probably in others be better, that is, fitter for expressing their meaning: at all events they will be better for the people who have been nurtured under them. Hence, seeing that God has been pleased to glorify His infinite power and wisdom by the infinite variety of His Creation, and vouchsafes to receive glory from the diversities of gifts in His creatures, every people, every Church, every community is to honour Him after its kind, by the full and free exercise of all those faculties, intellectual and moral, which He has assigned to them, in conformity to those hereditary notions, which are themselves a portion of their intellectual and moral inheritance. The unity of light is not broken up and dissolved, but rather shines out with more resplendent beauty, in the varied hues of the rainbow. Why then should men split into hostile parties, nay, why should they not live in fellowship and amity, and unite in the worship of God, though one portion of them think it right to wear a red turban, another a green? He who lets the light shine upon the red, lets it shine no less complacently upon the

green. This will readily be acknowledged; for, when we see a prejudice in others, we are quick in seizing its absurdity, however blind we may be to its counterpart in ourselves. It may indeed be a reprehensible wilfulness not to give up our own will for the sake of peace; but it is a far more reprehensible wilfulness to impose our will on others, though at the risk of war: and this is the primary evil, of which the other is the natural effect and reaction. And when the practice, the abandonment of which is required of a man,—is that of all his friends, of his countrymen, of his fathers and forefathers for generations, manifold motives of honour and reverence and tender affection constrain him to cling to it; and he will almost deem that he should be a traitor to the memory of his ancestors, if he were to cast it off at the dictate of those who treat it with contemptuous reproach. At all events, if there be any essential spiritual advantage in the posture of kneeling in prayer, we are much likelier to win our brethren to follow our example, if we kneel lovingly by their sides, than if we try to thrust or drag them down perforce, or cast them out because they will not do as we do. This would be the best way, even if they formed part of the same congregation: provided that each prays and receives in faith and reverently, the posture matters little. But when the congregations are to be distinct, like the English and German under our Bishop at Jerusalem, what sort of a spirit must that be, which would prohibit their union as members of the same Church, because in the one congregation it is the custom to pray kneeling, in the other, standing? Even in an army, in which uniformity is of greater moment than in any other body, the stiffest martinet that ever lived would allow regiments of cavalry and infantry to stand together in the same battle-array. Nor would any one but a madman maintain that the Centaurs and Lapithae must continue for ever in unmitigated, irreconcilable hostility.

By Dr Pusey indeed the question of postures is regarded as of such primary importance, that, in a Note added to the third Edition of his Pamphlet, he has taken upon him to read a

grave lecture to the Lutherans for their irreverence in not kneeling at the reception of the Eucharist. In the course of it he says, in p. 147: "The Lutheran attitude of receiving it, (for it is Lutheran—) the Lutheran attitude of standing, as it is unexampled (the writer believes) elsewhere, so it has not the semblance of plea, which the Calvinist put forth for his position of sitting. Both are inventions of men; but the Calvinist, claiming to adhere to what he found on the *surface* of the Bible (for the attitude of kneeling is in a deeper sense involved in the words, 'they have eaten and worshipped') is at the least consistent." It is quite distressing to see a good and learned man flounder about thus, dashing at one rash assertion after another, for the sake of throwing shame on one of the best branches of the Church, without taking the trouble to ascertain the correctness of anything he says. The attitude of standing in prayer, for which the Lutherans are so severely reprehended, is shewn by M. Abeken to be expressly enjoined by the 20th Canon of the Nicene Council: *ἐπειδή τινές εἰσιν ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ γόνυ κλίνοντες καὶ ἐν ταῖς τῆς πεντηκοστῆς ἡμέραις· ὑπὲρ τοῦ πάντα ἐν πασῇ παροικίᾳ φυλάττεσθαι, ἑστῶτας ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ τὰς εὐχὰς ἀποδιδόναι τῷ Θεῷ.* *Whereas there are some persons who kneel on the Lord's day, and during the days of Pentecost, it seems good to the holy Synod, for the sake of having all things observed in every parish, that people should pray to God standing.* The desire of establishing uniformity in such matters had already crept into the Church; and the Council orders that on those days, on which the Resurrection is especially commemorated, all should stand in prayer, not kneel. For this, we learn from Basil, in his Treatise on the Holy Spirit (c. xxvii), was the ground of the order: *ἀναγκαίως οὖν τὰς ἐν αὐτῇ (τῇ κυριακῇ) προσευχὰς ἑστῶτας ἀποπληροῦν τοὺς ἑαυτῆς τροφιμοὺς ἡ ἐκκλησία παιδεύει, ἵνα τῇ συνεχεῖ ὑπομνήσει τῆς ἀτελευτήτου ζωῆς τῶν πρὸς τὴν μετάστασιν ἐκείνην ἐφοδίων μὴ ἀμελῶμεν.* Augustin too speaks of the practice ordained by the Church, as general, if not universal: "*Ut autem stantes in illis diebus et omnibus dominicis oremus, utrum ubique servetur*

ignoro: tamen quid in eo sequatur Ecclesia, dixi ut potui; et arbitror esse manifestum:" Epist. lv. 32. Several other passages from the Fathers, bearing witness to this practice, are quoted, along with these, by Beveridge in his note on the Nicene Canon. Now even from hence, if we had no decisive testimony to the contrary, we might conclude that the ordinary mode of receiving the Eucharist in the early Church would be standing, the very mode which Dr Pusey, for the sake of casting reproach upon the Lutherans, says he believes to be "unexampled:" and if we look into Bingham (xv. v. 3), we find that such was actually the case. All the evidence that he cites is in proof of this mode; nor does he produce any for kneeling at the Eucharist, though he tries by inference to make out that this must also have been in use. On the other hand, Augusti, in his *Christian Archeology* (vol. viii. p. 250), says: "That the practice of kneeling at the Communion, *which prevails among the Catholics and the Lutherans*, both at the consecration and the distribution, did not arise till the 12th or 13th centuries, or become universal till later, has been set beyond a question by the learned enquiries of Basnage, Deyling, De Lith, and Cotta.—The adoration of the Host at its elevation may have been the first occasion of this practice; but that it is not inseparable from that adoration is proved by the example of the Lutherans, who reject the elevation and adoration of the elements, *yet have retained the kneeling at the Communion.*" This is not the place for enquiring into the correctness of the former assertion; but at all events this extract will shew with what carelessness, on such an occasion most reprehensible, Dr Pusey wrote, that the attitude of standing in receiving the Communion "*is Lutheran*," and that he believes it to be "*unexampled elsewhere.*" So far indeed is it from being the Lutheran practice, that, in the controversy recently excited in Bavaria by the order that all the troops, Protestants as well as Romanists, should kneel down whenever the Host is elevated or carried by, a main argument urged by Harless, a strenuous Lutheran, who contended against this oppressive order in the Bavarian Chamber, and afterwards by his pen, is, that "*the chief outward sign of the Lutheran*

faith is kneeling at the reception of the Eucharist, as before the Lord who is present when it is received," and that, as it is not their practice to kneel on other occasions, this act, which with them has such a solemn significance, ought not to be required as a mere mark of respect, such as a stranger may be expected to pay to religious rites, even when he does not take part in them. As to Dr Pusey's assertion that both standing and sitting "are inventions of men," what is kneeling? If any one of the three postures, as applied to the reception of the Eucharist, is more an invention of man than the other two, it is assuredly kneeling. For we may suppose the Apostles at the original institution to have been sitting, or, which amounts to the same thing, lying: or it is possible that they may have been standing, after the manner of eating the Passover: but assuredly they were not kneeling. In like manner the other passages in the New Testament, in which the Communion is spoken of, are compatible with the supposition that the recipients may have stood or sat, but quite inconsistent with the notion of their having knelt. And few soberminded men will be able to penetrate to that deeper sense, in which, Dr Pusey tells us, the attitude of kneeling at the Eucharist "is involved in the words, *they have eaten and worshipt.*" He who seeks for light on such a point will rather go to the New Testament, than to the 22nd Psalm. It is by straining his eyes thus to find out what is not, that Dr Pusey, as it would seem, has almost lost the power of seeing what is. At the same time we may be thoroughly convinced that our Church, in ordaining that her children shall kneel at the Communion, has made a very wise use of her rightful "power to decree rites and ceremonies." It is thus that Hooker justifies her practice (v. 68. 3): "We do that which fitness and great decency hath made usual."

The foregoing remarks may suffice with regard to a large part of the stumblingblocks and walls of partition which Dr Pusey tries to set up, for the sake of preventing a nearer union between our Church and that of Prussia. Even if the whole series of statements in his elaborate contrast between the two

Churches were correct,—which they are not,—even if they did not abound, as they do, in gross misrepresentations,—the main part of the discrepancies ought not to be deemed obstacles to unity. But there are one or two points in the contrast, which call for a somewhat closer examination, in order that the reader may see how utterly fallacious it is. The most important article in it would seem to be that which stands at the head of the list, and which certainly does set forth a wide difference of view concerning the nature and office of the Church. We, Dr Pusey asserts, hold "One Holy Catholic Church throughout all the world, knit together by its Bishops, as 'joints and bands,' under its One Head, Christ, and joined on by unbroken succession to the Apostles;" while the Lutherans hold "an indefinite number of Churches, hanging together by an agreement in a scheme of doctrine framed by themselves, and modified by the civil power." Between these views, as thus stated, there is undoubtedly a vast discrepancy, almost a repugnancy: and a person who knew nothing of the history of the German Reformation, would suppose, from what Dr Pusey here says, that Luther and his followers must either have never read, or must have rejected the New Testament, or at all events the Epistles of St Paul. What then would be his amazement, if he were told that, while we, in the Apostles Creed, profess our belief in "the Holy Catholic Church," and again, in the Nicene Creed, that in "one Catholic and Apostolic Church," the Lutherans, retaining the three Catholic Creeds, profess the very same belief! and further that, in the 7th Article of their peculiar Confession, they declare: "Item docent, *quod una Sancta Ecclesia perpetuo mansura sit: est autem Ecclesia congregatio Sanctorum, in qua Evangelium recte docetur, et recte administrantur Sacramenta:*" of which latter words the English Article on the Church, the 19th, is almost a literal translation: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered." "*I suppose,*" he would exclaim, "*the author of this pamphlet must know no-*

thing about the subject he is speaking of: or else he must belong to that Society, who, calling themselves by the name of Jesus, have often been dismally unscrupulous about truth, if they could serve any party purpose." Of the plea of ignorance unfortunately Dr Pusey cannot avail himself, even with regard to this one subject, sorry as that plea would be: for in former years he has shewn a remarkable acquaintance with the history of the German Church, and with its theology; and in this very passage he cites a subsequent clause from the same 7th Article of the Confession of Augsburg, for the sake of substantiating his charge, that the Lutherans hold "an indefinite number of Churches, hanging together by an agreement in a scheme of doctrine framed by themselves." The first clause of the Article,—*Docent, quod una Sancta Ecclesia perpetuo mansura sit,*—which peremptorily refutes the assertion that the Lutherans hold "*an indefinite number of Churches,*"—Dr Pusey omits. The second clause,—*Est autem Ecclesia congregatio Sanctorum, in qua Evangelium recte docetur, et recte administrantur Sacramenta,*—which proves the identity between the Lutheran view of the Church and ours, and thus refutes the assertion of their total discrepancy,—Dr Pusey omits. The third clause,—*Et ad veram unitatem Ecclesiae satis est consentire de doctrina Evangelii et administratione Sacramentorum,*—he quotes, but only to misinterpret it, as proving that the Lutherans hold "an indefinite number of Churches, hanging together by an agreement in a scheme of doctrine framed by themselves." Here the last words, *framed by themselves,* introduce a notion alien to the Article, which is an arbitrary interpolation of Dr Pusey's. Nor does he notice how the very words which he quotes, by asserting *the unity of the Church,—unitatem Ecclesiae,* —refute his statement that the Lutherans only hold "*an indefinite number of Churches.*" For the contrast would be wholly unmeaning, unless this statement, placed as it is, were designed to signify that the Lutherans do not hold the unity of the Church. As to the words which Dr Pusey cites,—*Et ad veram unitatem Ecclesiae satis est consentire de doctrina Evangelii et*

administratione Sacramentorum,—they merely restate the preceding proposition, that the Church is *congregatio Sanctorum, in qua Evangelium recte docetur, et recte administrantur Sacramenta*, or, in other words, "a congregation of faithful people, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered." The reason why this proposition is repeated in the German Confession, is, because the Article proceeds to state, what we lay down in the 34th,—*Nec necesse est ubique esse similes traditiones humanas, seu ritus aut caeremonias ab hominibus institutas.* Agreement in the true doctrine of the Gospel, and in the administration of the Sacraments, is declared to be enough to constitute those who so agree members of the Church: and it is not necessary that there should be a like agreement in human traditions and rites and ceremonies. That *the doctrine of the Gospel*, with regard to which agreement is required, is not "*a scheme of doctrine framed by themselves*," but is equivalent to our expression, "*the pure word of God*," and refers solely to the fundamental principles of our faith, which have always been accounted essential to membership in the Church, ever since the last charge given by our Lord to the Apostles, nay, without which there never would have been a Church at all,—is plain from the concluding words of the Article: *Sicut inquit Paulus: Una fides, unum Baptisma, unus Deus et Pater omnium, etc.* The *consensus de doctrina Evangelii* is equivalent to *una fides*, the one Faith, which is the root and ground of the Church.

It is true, this third clause in the German Article does exclude a considerable part of the conditions, which Dr Pusey assigns to the Anglican view of the Church. The Lutheran Confession concurs with ours, in holding "One Holy Catholic Church throughout all the world:" but it does not lay down that this Church must be "knit together by its Bishops, as *joints and bands*,—and joined on by unbroken succession to the Apostles.'" Nor has our Church ever laid down this: in fact she has carefully and deliberately abstained from doing so. The large-minded wisdom which guided our Reformers, withheld them

from asserting that either Episcopacy or the Apostolical Succession is essential to the idea of the Church; and they understood St Paul much too well, to indulge in the idle fancy, that Bishops are the only *joints and bands* by which *the body has nourishment ministered* to it, and *is knit together.* The parallel passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians taught them that the body is *joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth,* that is, every living member of the Church; though of course more especially they who give themselves to the work of the ministry, to the preaching of that word, and the administration of those sacraments, whereby the life, flowing from the Head, circulates through the body of the Church. Of course I am aware that, in the Preface to the Ordinal, our Church has stated that the three Orders of the Ministry have subsisted "from the Apostles time," and has provided that these three Orders "may be continued and reverently used and esteemed in the United Church of England and Ireland." But here also she has refrained from asserting the necessity of the three Orders: and when we compare this Preface with what is said concerning the ministry in the 23d Article, which is worded with such exemplary judicious caution, it is clear that the omission is intentional, and that the framers of our Formularies purposely kept from pronouncing that either Episcopacy or the Apostolical Succession is essential to the constitution of a Church. They belonged to that rare class of wise men, who prize and love their own hereditary institutions, yet do not think it becomes them to insist that all the world shall adopt the same. So that Dr Pusey, in order to make as wide a breach as possible between our Church and the German, has not only grossly misrepresented and falsified their view of the Church, but has also made very important additions to ours, for which he has no sufficient warrant in our Formularies.

But we have still to see how he gets at his statement that the Lutherans hold "an indefinite number of Churches." In a note he quotes the beginning of the first Article in the Confession of Augsburg: "*The Churches among us teach:*" *Ecclesiae magno con-*

sensu apud nos docent. Instead of taking his representation of the Lutheran view of the Church from the Article which expressly treats of the Church,—of which Article he cannot possibly have been ignorant, seeing that he quotes a sentence from it immediately after,—he brings forward a sentence in which the word Church is used in a different, but very common sense, with reference to the various branches of the One Universal Church in particular countries. The princes who sign the Confession of Augsburg, that is, those of Saxony, Brandenburg, Luneburg, Hesse, Anhalt, along with the Senate of Nurenberg and of Reutlingen, declare what the Churches in their territories, *Ecclesiae apud nos,* teach: and because they adopt this, the natural and legitimate mode of expressing themselves, they are charged by Dr Pusey with denying the Unity of the Church; and the whole Lutheran Church is implicated in that charge. With as good reason might he prosecute the Churchbuilding Society for heresy, because they tell us year after year how many *Churches* they have assisted in building and repairing: and what an arch-heretic must the Bishop of London be, who engaged in the work of building fifty *Churches,* and has completed a large part of them! Nay, Dr Pusey himself is gravely involved in the same heresy; perhaps no man living under the Bench, has been so great an offender in this line. Moreover what a heretic must St Paul have been! who speaks of *the Churches of the Gentiles, the Churches of Christ, the Churches of Asia, the Churches of Judea, the Churches of Galatia, the Churches of Macedonia!* Yet to St Paul was it especially given to proclaim and unfold the great idea of the Unity of the Church, and of its living union with its Divine Head.

There yet remains one more term in the conception of the Church which Dr Pusey ascribes to the Lutherans. They hold "an indefinite number of Churches (he says), hanging together by an agreement in a scheme of doctrine framed by themselves, *and modified by the civil power.*" The allegation that their scheme of doctrine is "*framed by themselves,*" he does not support by any authority: this is a mere fabrication of his own brain. On the words "*modified by the civil power,*" he subjoins the

following note: "As in the Union of the Lutheran and Reformed bodies." Here one should have expected of a person who desired to speak the language of truth and justice, that, before he cast such an imputation on a sister Church, he would have taken some pains to ascertain whether the influence exercised by the Civil Government at the Union of the two branches of the Protestant Church in Prussia was at all essentially different from that exercised by our own Civil Government repeatedly from the beginning of the Reformation down to the passing of the Act of Uniformity. On this point let me cite the satisfactory testimony of M. Abeken. "I am sure (he says, in his Letter to Dr Pusey, with a generous trust that his opponent's candour would be as pure as his own) you will be glad to hear that your information must have been incorrect. And I wonder from what source you can have derived that information. You cannot have seen any new symbolical book drawn up for the purpose of the Union, any alteration made in the former confessions, any formulary of worship containing a new doctrine or even a modified view. If there were such, they would have been the work of the ministerial or clerical body, not of the civil power, which would stand in no other relations to them than in England the State or the Government does to your Articles. But I may confidently say, there are none. If in some parts of Germany the clergy agreed about the manner in which the doctrines were to be stated in the Catechism for the instruction of children, (as they did for example in Baden,) they disclaimed, at the same time, any intention of giving to this form a symbolical authority; and the civil power had nothing at all to do with it. But in Prussia not even so much was done; and the Church, taught by the experience of former failures, purposely avoided any meddling with the doctrines, any modification of expressions in the symbols, any attempt at framing new terms, that might embody or seem to embody new doctrinal views. The Union was simply an acknowledgement that such shades of opinion in the views entertained of divine mysteries, as existed between the different bodies of German Protestants,

need not and indeed ought not to prevent them from acknowledging and receiving together these mysteries, from joining hands and minds in prayer and acts of worship, and from working and acting together as one body for the glory of God and the propagation of the Gospel. This principle, the leading principle of that Union, I believe to be neither a sectarian nor a latitudinarian, but the only true Catholic principle of union. And if it was suggested by a pious and truly Christian King, surely this is only a reason to be more thankful to God, not to look with mistrust upon it as coming from the civil power. It is neither to learned theologians, nor to ordained priests, that the power of benefiting the Church is confined, thank God!"

M. Abeken doubtless felt sure that Dr Pusey would not only be glad to hear that the Prussian Church was free from some at least of those corruptions of doctrine and practice by which he had supposed it defaced, but that he would also be glad to seize the first opportunity of correcting the misstatements, to which, through carelessness and haste, he had given currency, and to atone, as far as he could, by an ample and ready apology for having subjected a great Christian body to wholly unmerited reproach. In fact one cannot well see how any man of common honesty, any man who would shrink from the guilt of false and calumnious detraction, could fail to do so. But alas! Dr Pusey did nothing of the sort. Although M. Abeken had thus clearly and mildly pointed out to him, that his assertion concerning the modification of Lutheran doctrine by the civil power was founded on erroneous information, or at all events that the one fact adduced to substantiate that assertion had been wholly misconceived,—although, in a tone of gentle expostulation, he had shewn how the view of "an indefinite number of Churches," which Dr Pusey had profest to deduce from the Lutheran Confession, is directly refuted by the explicit declaration of that Confession concerning the unity and perpetuity of the Church,—although he had in like manner demonstrated the erroneousness of several other statements, —Dr Pusey, when speaking of M. Abeken's Reply in a note

to the third edition of his Pamphlet, hardly condescends to retract a single one of his misrepresentations,—none indeed, except where he tries to prove that the errour is quite immaterial, or that the correction only makes the case of the Lutherans still worse than he had previously portrayed it. Toward M. Abeken personally indeed he expresses himself kindly; but he has the assurance to say (p. 150), "With regard to the question now at stake, this pamphlet contains nothing in any way to change the view put forward in my own, as to our present relation to that body." And then, instead of confessing his own misconduct toward the Lutheran Church, and humbling himself, as he ought to have done, on account of it, he proceeds to extort a confirmation of his own views from an expression of M. Abeken's concerning the Jerusalem Bishopric. What course can one take with such a controversialist? It is most painful to suspect a good man, it is, if possible, still more painful to accuse him, of deliberate wilful falsehood; nor can I believe Dr Pusey to have been guilty of such. Yet, if any other writer had acted as he has done, who would acquit him of it? Let us suppose, if we can, that he did really overlook the first two sentences in the Lutheran Article on the Church, although he quotes the very next sentence to wrest it against the Lutherans, and the whole Article does not fill nine lines,—let us suppose, if we can, that he did conscientiously conceive that the Lutheran view of the Church is enunciated in the first words of their Confession,—and it is necessary to hoodwink one's judgement in order to make such admissions,—yet, when these oversights, — granting them to have been such,—were pointed out so plainly by M. Abeken, how was it possible for Dr Pusey any longer to continue blind to them? And if he could not so continue, why did he not confess them? why did he not retract them? It appears indeed from Dr Pusey's Note, that the previous part of his Pamphlet was already in print, before he saw M. Abeken's Reply. But what of that? Surely it would not have been a very great labour to cancel a leaf or two for the sake of truth; or else to add a few sentences in candid acknowledgement of

errour in the Note. Surely it would have been better to do this, than to send out a paragraph again, which quite bristles with falsehoods. Even though the effect of these falsehoods was to incense men's minds against the Jerusalem Bishopric, and to make them look with contempt and disgust on the Lutheran Church, and with reprobation on our Prelates for entering into any connexion with it, this can hardly be accepted as a sufficient justification. And be it remembered, though falsehoods uttered in ignorance may in some measure be excusable, he who does not contradict them when their real nature is explained to him, he who allows them to circulate still, nay, issues them anew, under the authority of his name,—and that of Dr Pusey's is unhappily very great, and on questions of German theology almost absolute, with a large part of our Church,—is no less guilty, than if he had uttered them from the first with the set purpose of deceiving. In what manner Dr Pusey may palliate his conduct before his own conscience, I know not. Looking upon it as I can, with an earnest desire to think well of him, I see no way of accounting for the gross misrepresentations, which, not on this occasion solely, he has not only committed, but persisted in, except on the supposition that he must have wellnigh lost the faculty of discerning between truth and falsehood. In former times, when he loved the Germans, he loved truth, and contended for it earnestly, as it is the nature of the Germans to do. But they who get within the eddy of Rome,—it has been seen in a number of instances, recent and earlier,—are brought to believe that there is something better than truth; and thus they gradually lose the love of truth, and in the end almost the very sense of it. That this calamity should befall such a man as Dr Pusey is very strange and perplexing, even as a psychological fact; as a moral fact it is most awful. When such a man can be thus given up to delusions, let him who thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.

I have spoken gravely, severely, but surely not more so than the occasion demands. A lying spirit is passing to and fro through the land, and seems, like that in Micaiah's vision, to be especially

taking possession of the spirits of the prophets, manifesting itself in those works, which, inasmuch as they profess to treat of matters connected with religion, ought above all to consecrate themselves to the God of Truth. Our religious literature, in many of its departments, especially in its journals and newspapers, is lamentably characterized by a carelessness about truth, a readiness in making rash assertions on the slightest grounds, prejudice and animosity supplying the lack of evidence. Hence, when this spirit shews itself in high places, the good of the Church requires that it should be exposed and rebuked. Still the task of exposing it is very unwelcome and painful. Therefore I will not go through a detailed examination of the other charges brought against the Lutheran Church in Dr Pusey's cumulative sentence. I will merely remark, lest any one should still be beguiled by his assertions to think unjustly of that Church, that several of his statements, when stript of his offensive mode of putting them, amount to nothing more than that, like our own Church, she has exercised her acknowledged power of decreeing concerning rites and ceremonies, wherein her judgement, as was natural, has often followed a different track from ours. Others again are merely the necessary consequences from the absence of Episcopacy: in a Church where there are no Bishops, it could not well be held that Episcopal Ordination or Confirmation are essential. Nor was it quite seemly to introduce a contrast, apparently disparaging to the Lutherans, with regard to the rite of Confirmation, when, as is known to all who have any acquaintance with the working of the Church in Germany, and as Dr Pusey himself has stated in his First Reply to Mr Rose (p. 75), "the solemnity and influence of that rite in the German Church now far exceeds that generally observable in our own." As to the latter items in Dr Pusey's long invective, I will merely quote M. Abeken's words (p. 43): "On page 132 you return to more general, yet very positive charges against the spirit of our Church; and here I can do nothing but contradict them in as general and unqualified terms. You seem entirely to forget that individual rationalist writers, be they clergymen or laymen, are not the German Church; whatever their extravagances may

have been, I confidently say, *we, the Church,* do *not* regard the "Faith" as "susceptible of subsequent correction and developement;" but we too receive it as "once for all delivered to the saints," although we believe, with the Church of England, that particular Churches may err (Art. xix.), and their errours be *corrected,* and, with you and all teachers, that man's apprehension of that faith may be *develop*t;—we do *not* boast ourselves modern, but, without boasting, would suggest that the *Communion of saints,* which we confess with you in the Creed, is as ancient as God's revelation;—we do *not* date ourselves, either "truly" or untruly, from Luther, much as we love and respect that truly great man;—we do *not* claim to be the parent of all Reformed Churches,—for even though the Prussian Minister of State, whom you quote, had made use of such inappropriate language, a Prussian Minister of State is no Church authority with us; yet that Prussian Minister of State has *not* brought forward any such glaring absurdity, but, in speaking of the "Mother of all Evangelic *Confessions,*" alluded only to the undoubted fact, that the great movement of the Reformation originated in Germany, and that the *Augsburg Confession,* as the first of all declarations of return to the primitive faith of the Church, has greatly influenced most others;—we sympathize with all branches of the Church of Christ that have retained the foundations of Christianity; we therefore do *not* reject the Ancient Church of the East; and the very facts which you allude to, namely, that of the refusal of the Greek bishops to accept the hand tendered by German divines, shews that our German Churches were at least as desirous as the English and Scotch bishops were, to enter into active communion with the East; for they did neither more nor less than the bishops, in applying to the Eastern Churches; and as for the refusal they met with, did the English and Scotch bishops not meet with the same? And could they expect anything else from bishops who had condemned the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, in those very points in which it is the doctrine of the Church of England too; and had asserted against it Romish doctrines, not only in the synod of Bethlehem in 1672, but in two

previous synods of 1638 and 1642? Not that I attach great importance to all these synods; I think they have very little claim to represent the "Ancient Church of the East," and could little understand or appreciate the doctrines they condemned. A sad thing would it be, if the claims of the Church of England, or of our Church, or of any Church, to that name rested on the acknowledgement of such judges!" Of all these direct contradictions to his statements Dr Pusey takes no notice. He cannot refute them: but he issues his own false statements again without the slightest modification.

Where such gross misrepresentations of the Prussian Church, as have here been exposed, gained credit, one cannot wonder that a considerable repugnance should have been felt to the Jerusalem Bishopric, as bringing us into closer connexion with her. Still one should hardly have expected that this repugnance would have been carried to such a pitch of fierceness, as that not merely ignorant and half-witted railers, but even such a man as Mr Newman should have lancht his anathema against it. In one of his *Sermons bearing on the Topics of the Day*, that writer, who ordinarily exercises a strict controll over his speech, asserts, in language which he swells out with the most terrible denunciations of ancient prophecy (p. 379), that "the outward notes of the Church are partly gone from us, and partly going; and a most fearful judgement it is. *Behold . . . the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in his going forth; and the moon shall not cause her light to shine.—All the bright lights of heaven will I make dark over them, and set darkness upon thy land, saith the Lord God.* This in good measure has fallen upon us. The Church of God is under eclipse among us." On this passage, which far more significantly describes the state of the writer's own mind, than that of our Church,—according to that confusion of the subjective with the objective, which is a characteristic of certain mental diseases,—for assuredly the notes of a Church have not been going from us, but rather coming out more clearly, however dim they may still be, during the last thirty years,—it is observed at the foot of the page,

that the assertion that the notes of a Church are "going" from us, was intended as "an allusion to the appointment of an Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem, which has had a most grievous effect in weakening the argument for our Church's Catholicity, and in shaking the belief in it of individuals." And the writer adds an imprecation, equally exemplary for its Christian humility and love: "May that measure utterly fail and come to nought, and be as though it had never been!" In like manner even Mr Hope says (p. 7): "If I think our Church has forfeited her Catholicity by this act, I am bound as a Catholic to leave her;" though, it is true, this is put hypothetically; and the object of his Pamphlet is to shew that the act, according to his mode of viewing it, does not involve the forfeiture of our Catholicity. Dr Pusey too, by way of warning to our Prelates, tells them (p. 91), that "circumstances connected with the plan of sending a Bishop of the English Succession to Jerusalem have awakened very deep and serious misgivings.—Many persons, whose minds had become disquieted about our Church, have, even when not set wholly at rest, yet come at last to the result, that unless our Church be committed to anything wrong, it is their duty to remain within her, and see what God will do for her. They would even think it undutiful to imagine beforehand any case, which would compell them to abandon her, as a child would shrink from contemplating that its parent would commit a sin, which should compell it to leave her roof." These passages shew into what a state of feverish delusion many members of our Church had even then been brought: and if we ask how they had been brought into it, the answer is plain: by the teaching of that school which has derived its name from the Tracts for the Times, by that teaching, of the effects of which Dr Pusey speaks with such highflown boastings. Yet the words just cited prove that many actually were in that unnatural condition which he describes: they were imagining cases which, they fancied, would compell them to abandon their parent. Had they not been in that state already, the Jerusalem Bishopric would never have awakened such thoughts in them. Things being so,

it would have beseemed Dr Pusey to point out the perversity and sinfulness of such wayward fancies and illusions, and to reprove and remonstrate with those who would not unwillingly have listened to his voice, rather than to encourage them by using all the arts, and more than the lawful arts of rhetoric to paint the act, which they were already disposed to regard as a sin of their parent, in the most offensive colours.

But there is another matter which forces itself upon our notice, the inconsistency and self-contradiction, which have been a pervading characteristic of the new school, or rather party, in our Church, and which were never displayed more glaringly than on this occasion. From the first, one of the leading principles which they profest and inculcated, at least in words, was submission to authority, especially to ecclesiastical authority, and reverence for it: and vehement and unceasing have been their attacks on those whom they called Ultra-Protestants, for their lack of such reverence and submission. Yet here, on account of a measure which clearly belonged to the province of the persons bearing the chief authority in our Church, which they alone were called and were competent to decide, and in the determination on which, as Mr Hope admits, all due forms were observed, they rebell against authority, imprecate curses upon its act, and threaten to leave the Church, unless her heads do just what to them seems right. Having been vociferous in crying out against the sin of Schism, they brood over it, and throw out menaces of committing it, much as a peevish boy might protest that he would run away from school. And while they are continually inveying against the evils of Private Judgement, and condemning the exercise of it in questions which rightfully and of necessity come before the conscience of each individual, which he is compelled to resolve and to act in, they exercise their private judgement with unhesitating presumption on a measure, on which most of them are no way qualified to pronounce an opinion, which no way comes within their sphere, and in which their consciences are no way implicated. Indeed there would be something almost ludicrous, if it were not so sad, in Mr Hope's naively exprest declaration: "*If I think our Church*

has forfeited her Catholicity, I am bound to leave her." So that each individual would be entitled to determine for himself, according to the measure of his own ignorance, on a question of such immense difficulty and complexity, involving a number of profound historical and theological investigations, as whether a particular branch of the Church of Christ *forfeits her Catholicity*, and cuts herself off from the great body of the Church, by an act belonging to the higher regions of ecclesiastical polity, an act in which private Christians are no way personally concerned, with regard to which they may indeed offer counsel, as Mr Hope was fully qualified for doing, to their ecclesiastical superiors, but the decision with regard to which must needs rest wholly with the lawful authorities in the Church: and this decision is not to be disputed or impugned, except in the sober way of argument, by private individuals, any more than an act of the Civil Legislature may be disputed and resisted by those who may disapprove of it. Nor is he merely to exercise his private judgement in such an affair; but, if that judgement, liable as it is to trip and stumble every moment through ignorance, or to walk awry from all sorts of blundering prejudices, pronounces the decision of the authorities in his Church to be wrong,—if he *thinks* them wrong,—he is further entitled to pronounce that his Church, the Church of his baptism, of his education, of his confirmation, his spiritual Mother and Monitress and Teacher and Guide, has *forfeited her Catholicity*; and on the strength of such a verdict, from the august tribunal of his own blunders and caprices, he is *bound to leave her.* Such is the teaching of the school which condemns the Reformers, because they exercised their judgement in matters immediately pertaining to the conscience, and in which they were personally called upon to decide whether they would obey God or man; although, in resolving to choose the former, they did not leave the Church by any act of their own, but were merely excommunicated and cut off by the schismatical act of a usurping lawless power. Thus does one extreme ever beget its opposite, often within the same breast.

Thus too have they who began by asserting the almost exclusive Catholicity of our Church, and denying that of all bodies which had not the same form of discipline, grown to question her Catholicity also, and after a while to deny it. Beginning with unchurching almost all other Reformed Churches, it was a judicial punishment that they should end in unchurching their own. As they had confounded the essence with the form, instead of discerning how it may manifest itself under a variety of forms, it was inevitable that, in the course of their disputatious prying and fingering, they must come to flaws in the form which was their idol. For they who will not believe in the realities of the divine order of the world, shall never be at a loss for excuses to pamper their unbelief: the sophist shall never lack sophisms to deceive himself with. But alas! he will also deceive others, as was seen even in the garden of Eden: and thus things have come to such a pass, that ignorant striplings and weak women have taken to troubling their scanty wits by doubts about the authority of the Church. Idler questions, more unfit for ordinary minds, more mischievous and delusive, cannot well be. Our business, the business of each one of us, is to do our duty in that state of life to which it has pleased God to call us, and to honour and obey the persons that are set over us, in the assurance that it does not belong to us to determine whether the powers that be are the rightful powers; for that this point has been determined by a higher Wisdom, even by Him who placed them where they are. The question which concerns us all individually, is of a different kind, not whether our Church is rightfully constituted, but whether we ourselves are living members of it, whether we personally have any part in Christ, whether we are holding fast to Him by faith, and bringing forth the fruit of good works. If we have any reasonable ground for cherishing a humble hope that we are so, we need not disquiet ourselves with questions about the Church, which are often mere substitutes, to evade the other more searching, more piercing inquiry. *Ubi Spiritus Dei est, ibi est Ecclesia:*

on this truth we may rest in confidence; and we are told how the presence of the Spirit is to be known,—by His fruits.

NOTE I: p. 39.

HERE I will insert the Address presented to the King of Prussia, as many at least of those who went up with it, will be glad to have a memorial of a day, which they will not easily forget.

"SIRE,

"WE, the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Lewes, humbly request to be permitted to express to your Majesty the gratification it has afforded us, that your Majesty should have been chosen by our beloved Queen to be one of the Baptismal Sponsors to the Heir Apparent of these realms, and should graciously please to leave your own Kingdom, in order to be present in person on this holy and august occasion. We rejoice in it as a most hopeful sign, that God should move the hearts of Sovereigns to seek to be united to each other by these sacred ties of Christian brotherhood. Already for many generations have the destinies of Prussia been closely linked with those of England. We have fought side by side in many a war: we have stood up together as the champions of the liberties of Europe: and God has blest our efforts, and consummated them on that glorious field, the very name of which seemed to declare that our alliance was well-pleasing in His eyes. Many of us remember the time when your Majesty's illustrious Father honoured our land with his presence: we remember the universal joy with which the Deliverers of Europe were welcomed: and while the feelings of those days are revived by the thought of a King of Prussia again visiting our shores, with deeper joy we hail your Majesty's coming to celebrate an alliance of still fairer promise.

"Nor can we refrain from expressing our gratitude to your Majesty for the signal mark of favour bestowed on our Church,

when your Majesty selected her to be the instrument for accomplishing your desire of promoting the glory of God by the mission of a Bishop to Jerusalem. We pray that God may vouchsafe to accept your Majesty's offering, and may render this Mission the means of manifold blessings, not only to those whom He has moved to unite in sending it, but also to those other branches of His Church in the East, which have been so long separated from us, and checkt and blighted, by the calamities of centuries, as well as to His own ancient people. Through His blessing, we hope and pray that the voice of the Lord may again proceed as a voice of power out of Jerusalem, and that the trumpet of the pure Gospel may sound from the holy hill of Zion. At the same time we would regard that Mission, no less than your Majesty's present arrival in our land for such a sacred work, as a pledge that those portions of Christendom, which were separated, not only from the Southern half of the Western Church, but also from each other, by the events of the Reformation, will henceforward be drawn together in closer bonds of union.

"We commend our Infant Prince to your Majesty's prayers and Christian love now and through life. And we pray Almighty God, that He will bless your Majesty in every way, and that, as He has raised you up for the strengthening and purifying of His Church in Germany, so it may please Him graciously to accomplish this His purpose, and whatsoever else He shall ordain for the building up of His Church in holiness and righteousness, in pure faith and love."

The King, who had evidently been moved by the Address, read the following answer. "Reverend Gentlemen,—The expression of Christian sympathy from so respectable a portion of the National Clergy of this country is highly gratifying to me; and I say *Amen* to all the wishes and prayers you express." Then, speaking in his own language, he said, among other things, in the most gracious manner: "Es war eine wahre Wonne solche Gesinnungen zu hören. Sie werden allgemeine Zustimmung und Freude durch das ganze Deutschland erwecken." "It was quite a delight to

hear such sentiments. They will excite general sympathy and joy through all Germany." I have also reason to know that he still retains a pleasing recollection of the Address.

After what has been said above, (pp. 78–82,) there seems to be no need of adding anything further in reply to the objections raised by the Anti-protestant party in our Church against the admissibility of a person, who had not received episcopal Confirmation, to be Sponsor to a child in our communion. For it is plain that those objections were little else than an ebullition of party-spirit; and had it not been for the Jerusalem Bishopric, they would probably never have been stirred. For, as was to be expected from our national and political affinity, and from the frequent intermarriages between our Royal House and those of the German Sovereigns, as well as from the intimate relation ever conceived to subsist between our Church and those of Protestant Germany, it has repeatedly happened that the sponsors for our Royal Infants have been selected from among the German Princes and Princesses. Yet I am not aware that the most narrowminded formalist in our Church ever interposed any scruple: at all events it was overruled by ever-recurring practice. In fact, not a twelvemonth before, at the Baptism of the Princess Royal, the Duke of Saxe Coburg, the Queen Dowager, and the Duchess of Kent had been among the Sponsors; but nobody, I believe, took it into his head that the Canons of our Church were violated thereby.

NOTE J: p. 40.

THAT our Church should have continued for so long a period,—now above a century and a quarter,—without anything like a deliberative and legislative council, has long been felt to be a gross anomaly, inconsistent with the true principles of ecclesiastical polity: and through the whole of that period there have been complaints of the suspension of our Convocation, and wishes, more or less loud, for its revival. It was a grand speech of Johnson's to Hume, that he would "stand before a

battery of cannon, to restore the Convocation to its full powers." And doubtless he would have been as good as his word; as he said to Boswell (v. i. p. 364.): "Would I not, Sir? Shall the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland have its General Assembly, and the Church of England be denied its Convocation?" In which argument there is more real force, than its polemical attitude might incline one to suspect. A wiser man, far more conversant with the principles of government, as of all things, has termed "the loss of the Convocation the greatest and, in an enlarged state-policy, the most impolitic affront ever offered by a Government to its own Established Church." See Coleridge's *Remains*, Vol. II. p. 208. In another passage in the same Volume (p. 36), we find him declaring that he has long regarded "the virtual abrogation of this branch of our Constitution as one of three or four Whig patriotisms, that have succeeded in de-anglicizing the mind of England." A similar view is implied in several passages of his invaluable Treatise *On the Constitution of the Church and State.*

Some of the chief evils which have resulted from this cause, have been forcibly stated by Archdeacon Manning in his first Charge, though along with a recognition of the benefits which have also arisen from it. "Who can doubt that by the suspension of the Church's legislative powers we have been protected against ourselves? Under the strong and dominant impulses of feeling which have fluctuated in the English Church in the last hundred and fifty years, it would have been a miracle of mercy if she had taken no unwise and intemperate act, of which we should now be inheriting the evil consequence. Yet after all, it must be said that it is an anomalous and unwholesome state for a Church to have no canonical legislation at all. If the same power by which her legislative functions are suspended, could bind down also the fleet and variable currents of human thought and feeling, and precipitate into a motionless form the fluctuations of national character; and if it could suspend also the manifold and mysterious workings of God's providence, under which an island people of five millions

has swelled into a universal empire, and the whole face of social life has been elevated and depressed, and varied in every feature, as by the undulating pressure of a mighty flood; then, indeed the Church might safely lay asleep her wise and watchful legislation. But is it not obvious that to this overlong suspension of her powers may be ascribed all that is sometimes alledged against her on the score of stiffness, and want of a self-adapting pliancy to meet the yearnings and changed habits and multiplied numbers of the people? Many of these objections are in fact without much meaning; but they point to where a hidden truth is lying. There are true and reasonable and good desires and yearnings of heart, to which at present she hardly makes the full reply: and who can say how much of what, as it is commonly so called, I will call Dissent, is owing to the unwilling inflexibility of her system, and to our inability to provide what we no less truly yearn to give, than they to enjoy? It is worthy of remark, that the only great effort made in the last century to provide Churches for the growing population of London and Westminster was made at the instance and petition of Convocation. Had the Church really acted in Synod since that day, it is not to be believed that the 80,000 souls in Bethnall Green, or the million reported by the Commissioners, should have been left destitute of spiritual guides. Other consequences of this suspension are also worthy of a thoughtful consideration. There are left upon the roll of her canons many, which through change of time can hardly be enforced. This is an evil in itself; but it leads to a greater. Because the undisguised neglect of these is not censured, it is argued that those also which may yet be enforced and are most expedient, have now no binding force. This touches the health of the conscience. I am not speaking of ritual orders only: there are rules and precepts affecting the highest laws of morality, through the neglect of which the very sources of life are frightfully tainted, and the holiest ordinances of God are habitually profaned." pp. 17-20.

To the same effect Mr Hope writes, in a powerful passage of his Pamphlet on the Jerusalem Bishopric (p. 60): "For

more than a century no Synod has been holden except in form; for two, no new body of Canons has been framed. Meantime the national habits and modes of thought have been changed. Spiritual destitution has fearfully increased. Schisms have been extended and legalized. The *Ecclesiastical* features of Parliament have been wellnigh done away. The Church of Ireland has become united to that of England. Dependent Churches have sprung up in the Colonies. Independent Churches are recognized in Scotland and America. Our Church is called upon to satisfy a thousand new wants,—to meet a thousand unforeseen emergencies,—to act without the State, yet in dependence on it,—to extend herself without means,—to maintain herself without authority,— to enforce discipline without possessing it,—to do all things decently and in order, without having a moment to collect herself, or to learn where she stands, or whither she is being hurried on. And yet, in the midst of these things, the zeal of her members for the most part serves but to add to her confusions. If her canons are obscure, they are still further perplexed by some isolated and hasty Act of Parliament, which raises as many difficulties as it quells. If funds are wanting to spread her doctrine, societies are formed to thwart her discipline. Everything is done piecemeal, uncertainly, inconsistently; no man respects his neighbour's handywork, because every man thinks his own principles as good as the other's, and has a right to think so, as long as there is no authority above them both. A Church legislature alone can hold out even a prospect of doing what is required: a Church legislature alone, it seems, is what no steady efforts are made by churchmen to obtain."

Similar arguments are urged by the Bishop of Salisbury in his Charge, in 1842. "In dealing with such subjects, it is impossible not to feel it to be a great anomaly that the Church is not permitted to speak her own sentiments through her rightly constituted organs, and to exercise those functions of deliberation and judgement which are entrusted to her by our constitution in Church and State. It is impossible not to feel that

it is unsatisfactory that the Church should not have any recognised mode of deliberating on subjects of whatever interest; of adapting her system to new exigencies; or of recording her decisions on the most important matters. This has now been the case for above a century; and we may well rather be thankful that no greater evils have resulted from it, than be surprised that some things have grown obsolete, which yet there is no authority to alter; that anomalies have sprung up, which it will be difficult to remove; and that various functions of high importance, which ought to be discharged by the Church on its own authority, and in its own sacred character, are carried on, with more or less of irregularity, but most imperfectly at best, by self-constituted societies, which have been almost compelled to undertake offices, from which the Church in her proper character, is debarred." p. 33. And the same excellent Prelate has re-exprest this opinion in his last Charge in 1845: "I do believe that in other respects much good might be done, and much evil prevented, by the existence of a living power of government in the Church, by which its system could be adapted to the changes which time works in the fabric of society, and its energies be directed, not by the mere voluntary efforts of individuals, but by lawful authority to a fuller recognition of the privileges, and a more earnest discharge of the duties, which rightly devolve upon it both at home and abroad." p. 9.

The convictions here exprest have been becoming more and more general of late years, along with the revival of a deeper consciousness of what the Church is and ought to be; and thus, at the last meeting of the Convocation in 1841, it appeared to be the unanimous wish, at least of the Lower House, to take some step indicative of their desire that their assembly might cease to be a mere form, and might be allowed to resume its constitutional functions. With this purpose a paragraph was inserted in the Address to the Queen,—the only measure which the Convocation is permitted to discuss,—expressing a hope that, should any questions arise touching the welfare of the Church,

on which her Majesty might desire to consult the Convocation, we might be enabled through God's blessing to deliberate upon them with Christian wisdom and moderation. I have no record of the exact words; but this was their purport. It is true, they are not very urgent; and the main part of the Lower House, if it had rested with us to draw up the Address, would gladly have spoken out with more decision and precision. But the amendment proposed with such a view was overruled, among other reasons, because, as the clause already stood, the Upper House had of their own accord pronounced an opinion favorable to the sitting of Convocation, — which a few years previously no one would have anticipated from them, — and because it was desirable that this opinion should proceed concurrently from the two Houses, without any dispute or difference about the terms in which it was to be worded. To have done less than this would have been regarded by most of us as a dereliction of a solemn duty. When, in the Latin service with which the meeting was opened, we prayed to God, the Father of Lights, and the Fountain of all Wisdom, that we, "qui in Nomine Tuo sub auspiciis clementissimae Reginae Victoriae hic convenimus, *Gratia Tua coelitus adjuti ea omnia investigare, meditari, tractare, et discernere valeamus, quae honorem Tuum et gloriam promoveant, et in Ecclesiae cedant profectum;*" and that His Spirit, "qui Concilio olim Apostolico, *huic nostro etiam nunc insideat, ducatque nos in omnem veritatem, quae est secundum pietatem; ut—Fidem Apostolicam et vere Catholicam firmiter et constanter teneamus omnes*, Tibique rite puro cultu intrepidi serviamus,"—many must assuredly have felt that it was a gross mockery to offer up such a petition, in the knowledge that on nothing whatsoever were we about to deliberate and determine, conducive to the glory of God or the good of the Church, unless we made some attempt to avert this profane mockery, by using the only opportunity granted to us of endeavouring to obtain the power to do that, in the execution of which we were seeking God's help and guidance. If we made this effort, we might clear our own souls from the guilt; and we might then leave

it to God to dispose and turn the heart of our Soverein to do what in His supreme wisdom He vouchsafed to decree for His Church. Else it would be more seemly that the prayer should be wholly omitted: so might its omission be a witness against us, to remind us of our sunken estate, and to bid us strive to regain the privileges we have lost.

On the other hand, while there has been this growing desire that the Church should be enabled to deliberate and legislate on matters concerning her welfare, opposite voices have been heard, voices of warning and dissuasion, as was to be expected in an affair of such difficulty and importance. Yet, even of those who have spoken dissuasively, almost all have begun by recognising that the present position of the Church is itself an anomaly, and that under favorable circumstances this anomaly, as the term itself implies, ought to be rectified. Thus for instance the Bishop of Ossory, in the Pamphlet in which he asserts the inexpediency of restoring the Synodical Powers of the Church at this time, opens his argument by saying, "I have long felt—that the want of a power of self-government in spiritual matters, under which the Church has so long laboured, is an anomaly in its constitution, which is discreditable and in many respects injurious to it. I have long looked forward to the time when this anomaly shall be removed, as not merely rendering the Church more perfect in theory, but more efficient for the great purposes of its institution" (p. 7). And he adds soon after (p. 9): "I am sure that the Bishops do hold that a power of self-government is essential to the perfection of the Church, and to its full efficiency." They who have objected to the revival of Convocation, have rested their arguments in the main on the ground, either that the constitution of the Convocation disqualifies it for discharging the functions of the supreme authority in our Church, or that, in the present state of the Church, the questions which would necessarily arise, if there were a body to discuss them, cannot be mooted without great danger.

To the latter objection, although it has been urged with the best intentions, by persons whose position and character equally

entitle them to respect, I would not for my own part attach much importance. For there are two staple arguments, one or other of which the *vis inertiae*, resident in human nature scarcely less than in matter, is wont to oppose to every project for the melioration of society, even when the project is acknowledged on all hands to be in itself highly beneficial. If things are going on quietly and peaceably, we are sure to be told, *Let well alone*, as the phrase is; *Do not disturb and trouble us; you see there is no need of any change, when everybody is so happy and contented.* On the other hand, if, as is mostly the case when a change is urgently called for, men's minds are agitated, and contentious passions are stirring, we are then warned against the hazard of lanching out on a stormy sea. And this will be the commonest case: for there is seldom a time when they who are looking out for dangers will not see a cloud, though it may be no bigger than a man's hand, in some quarter of the sky. Thus Archbishop Secker in 1761 alledged the perilous character of the times, as a decisive reason why the Convocation ought not to sit, though its sitting would otherwise be likely to promote the wellbeing of the Church: and doubtless in 1961, unless, as we trust, the Church has long before resumed her powers of self-government, the Primate of that day will repeat the same strain. In this manner the season for a well considered, well measured improvement passes away, under the delusive notion that timidity is prudence; whereas all history teaches that, especially in critical times, boldness has much more of real prudence. We are less likely to be overwhelmed by the surge, if we advance a-head, than if we lag in the midst of it. There is a profound wisdom, which most men will recognise at a distance, but very few at the moment of need, in Bacon's quaint remark, that "Occasion turneth a bald noddle, after she hath presented her locks in front, and no hold taken; or at least turneth the handle of the bottle first to be received, and after the belly, which is hard to clasp." He adds, "There is surely no greater wisdom than well to time the beginnings and onsets of things:" and so we may well lay down that the right time

for an innovation is, when its propriety and desirableness are recognised by the general consent of the persons best qualified to pronounce upon it. Now this, we have seen, is the case with regard to the need of some synodical assembly in the Church. Therefore let us not be deterred from following that general consent, because one partial danger is anticipated in this quarter, another in that. Were there no danger, little good could be expected. That which cannot be abused, will seldom be of much use. We all know that governments may pervert the powers committed to them: but it is no less certain that almost any form of government is far better than anarchy. A strong government too might, if it set law at defiance, do more harm than a weak one: yet there can be no surer maxim of polity, than that a strong government is better than a weak. Only let care be taken that the government be so constituted as to embody the greatest attainable amount of political wisdom and justice; and then let it act, the issue being committed to Him who overrules and orders all things. With regard to the immediate dangers apprehended in our day from the divisions in the Church, my own persuasion is, that the extreme opinions on either side would find very few, if any, representatives in an Ecclesiastical Synod. The experience of the last Convocation, scanty though it certainly was, confirmed the conclusion to which I had been brought by previous consideration, that the wisest and most soberminded among its members would exercise the chief influence in it, and that, if any violent propositions were brought forward, they would be rejected by a majority of above five to one.* On this point let me again quote

* In a paper circulated three years ago by the Clerical Committee establisht in the Diocese of St Asaph to take measures for the preservation of the two North-Welsh Sees, it is asserted that, "at the last Meeting of Convocation, held in the Autumn of 1841, all recognition of the authority of the [Ecclesiastical] Commission was absolutely and unequivocally disclaimed and repudiated." I know not whether this statement has appeared elsewhere, or how far it may have gained credence: but as, if it were correct, it would overthrow my position in the text, and refute a large part of my argument in behalf of the revival of Convocation, it

the Bishop of Salisbury's Charge for 1842. "There might be haste and heat and prejudice and ignorance and incapacity, and party divisions, and extreme opinions, and unsound judgements, and all the objections which ever attach to assemblies of fallible men, and from which Synods of Clergy cannot claim to be exempt. But I trust there would be found also prudence, and calmness, and knowledge, and sound judgement, and moderation, and impartial

seems worth while to mention that the statement is altogether incorrect, and without the slightest foundation. So far as my memory serves me, I do not believe that a word was said by any of the speakers in our brief debate on the Address, in any way touching on the authority of the Ecclesiastical Commission. The discussion which did take place, and some erroneous report of which must have furnisht occasion for this misstatement, turned on a totally different point. The Address sent down to us by the Upper House for our adoption naturally spoke of the deplorable religious destitution prevailing in large parts of England, and then, after expressing thankfulness on account of what had already been done to relieve that destitution, went on to urge that greater efforts were still needed. When this was read in the Lower House, the expression of thankfulness seemed to us to imply an approval of the recent Bill for the appropriation of Ecclesiastical Revenues. I do not believe that the framers of the Address had any conscious reference to that specific measure: they rather referred to what had been done of late years in the way of building new churches, and of increasing the number of labourers employed in the ministry. They can never have meant to inveigle the Lower House into a commendation of a measure, which a considerable majority of that House had strenuously resisted. But, when this unintentional covert meaning struck us, it became necessary to consider what was to be done, in order that we might not thus palpably belie our real feelings. Two courses suggested themselves: one was, to omit the expression of thankfulness; the other, to qualify it by introducing some exception with reference to the Act concerning the Cathedral Revenues; and the former was adopted, principally because it was more respectful to the Archbishop and the other Bishops who supported that Bill, and because no practical good was to be effected by a verbal condemnation of a measure which had already received the full sanction of the Legislature. So that the spirit which animated us was altogether different from that ascribed to us in the statement which I have felt called upon to contradict, and which, if it were well founded, would prove that the Convocation, were it allowed to proceed to business, would be a most pugnacious and stubborn body, that the spirit which led to its suppression, would immediately spring up afresh with

minds; I trust that faithful attachment to God's holy law, and an earnest desire to follow the guidance of the Spirit of wisdom and truth, would keep us, if not from the presence, yet from the predominance of evil, would restrain all excesses of a rash and meddlesome spirit, and teach us to repair what is defective and to supply what is lacking, without tampering with what is sound and true, and established, through the teaching of the Catholic Church, on the foundation of the Word of God," p. 35. There is much truth too in a remark made by the same Prelate in the House of Lords, when the Archbishop of Dublin presented the Petition on this subject in 1842, that, as the meeting of Parliament has often quieted disturbances which had arisen during the recess, so may a like result be not unreasonably anticipated from the sitting of Convocation. For there is a majesty in the voice of Law, when it proceeds from its constitutional organs, that strikes men with awe, and subdues their irritations, and commands their submission, if not their cordial assent. All too, who know anything of the general character of our Clergy, must be aware that, though one may here and there find a person, who fancies he is serving God with the spirit of a martyr, while he is stubbornly contending for his own fancies and prejudices, no principle is more dominant among the great body of them than the love of peace and order.

The other class of objections, grounded on the constitution of

undiminisht violence, and that the Lower House had learnt nothing in its century of suspended animation, but was eager to seize the very first opportunity of bidding defiance to the Upper House and to the temporal Government. Such an act as that ascribed to us, of "absolutely and unequivocally disclaiming and repudiating all recognition of the authority of the Ecclesiastical Commission," ought at all events to have been preceded by a calm and careful investigation of two wide and important questions,—how far the Commission itself is consistent with the principles of our Civil and Ecclesiastical Constitution, and with the precedents afforded by the history of our Church, and how far its measures called for such a disclaimer and repudiation. Had we come to such a decision without this previous investigation, we should have proved ourselves unfit, not merely to discuss the high matters of ecclesiastical polity, but the most trivial that ever came before a parish vestry.

the Convocation, as being an inadequate exponent for the thought and will and conscience of the Church, is of far more weight. In truth, even among those who have exprest a wish for its revival, I am not aware that any one has entertained a predilection for its particular form; which in the first instance was not adopted with any view to its exercising the functions of ecclesiastical government, and consequently is by no means specially suited thereto. In calling for its revival, our motive has been, that it is the only form of Ecclesiastical Synod which has been in use for centuries in our Church; and though its functions were originally rather civil than ecclesiastical, in course of time it drew ecclesiastical matters also within its sphere. A wise stateman will ever desire that his institutions should strike root in the past, and will often rather expect a stout tree from the stump of an ancient institution, than from the seed of one wholly new. The form in the present case still subsists. The Convocation meets along with every new Parliament. Hence it may more easily be set at work, and receive the reality of life, as well as the form. Nor would there be anything at all singular, — rather would it be in accordance with what has continually occurred in the historical development of political institutions, as we see, above all, in the present functions of our House of Commons,—that an institution should grow in the course of ages to occupy a very different position, and to discharge a very different office, from that for which it was originally created. Only in such cases its constitution ought to be so modified, as to bring it into nearer correspondence with its new functions.

As to the specific objections which have been brought forward, I cannot enter here into a detailed examination of them; which is the less needful, inasmuch as, without disputing a large part of what has been alledged, I would merely contend against the inference drawn from it, and would plead that difficulties springing from the forms of an institution are no more to preclude our making use of it, provided it promise to be beneficial, than the dangers which a busy or timid fancy may anticipate from its adoption. These objections have been urged with very great ingenuity, and

an extraordinary profusion of antiquarian lore, in an Article in *the Quarterly Review* for March 1845. Both the ingenuity and the learning however are of that kind which not seldom overreach themselves; and the Article resembles the pleading of an advocate, who scrapes everything together and strains every point to make out his case. Sundry diversities and anomalies are enumerated in the manner in which the members of Convocation are elected. But that such difficulties are not insurmountable, is proved by the fact, that the usual complement of members has been returned to serve in each successive Convocation, whenever a new Parliament has been summoned since the Restoration; so that on this score there is no lack of precedents: and though the controverted cases would naturally be more numerous, if the meetings were convened to transact ecclesiastical affairs, this body of precedents would serve as a useful guide, when difficulties occur. The diversities and anomalies in the mode of election are surely not greater than those which prevailed in the manner of returning members to the House of Commons, before the recent Reform-Bill. Yet the Reviewer would hardly maintain that these disqualified that House for bearing its part in the government of the English Empire. As everything that grows up under the influence of the elementary powers of Nature, is shaped by those powers into a certain peculiarity, or, so to say, individuality of form, thus, even in those things which man has fashioned at first in the same mould, Time, acting as an elementary power, by various processes educes diversity. Moreover in earlier ages man himself wrought more in sympathy with Nature, and did not think it an impeachment of his works, that they were not all cut and squared by the same rule. Ancient institutions were constructed somewhat in the style of the Cyclopean architecture; and experience has abundantly proved that they were not a whit the less fitted for weathering the storms of ages, or protecting those who dwelt within their shelter. Again the Reviewer propounds divers obscure questions with regard to the forms of proceeding; which prove that one of the earliest measures of a Convocation, after its revival, must needs be to appoint a Committee of Forms.

This Committee would in the first place ascertain the course to be observed in ordinary business; and the conditions of special cases would be investigated as they arose. Set a body of men to work, among whom we may without presumption calculate on finding a few endowed with some degree of intelligence; and it will be strange if they cannot make out how they are to proceed. Practice furnishes solutions for that which afar off appears insoluble, and cuts the knot which it cannot untie. It opens doors, sometimes by using more or less force, sometimes by whispering *Sesame*, where Speculation would pore and grope about, and protest, after years of wasted toil, that no door is to be found. A further class of objections is drawn from the enormous change which has taken place in the English Church, as well as in the Empire, no longer confined to the British Islands, but embracing colonies and dependencies in every quarter of the globe. Yet here again, that the difficulty is not insuperable, may be argued from the parallel case of our Parliament, which is now the Great Council, not for the British Isles merely, but for the whole Empire; and in this respect too, if we began to act, difficulties would soon smoothe themselves, and paths would be discovered, roads over impassable, and tunnels through impenetrable mountains. In this age, when mechanical power is accomplishing so many impossibilities, may we not deem that moral power will also be able to effect something? or must Faith and Hope and Love shrink from every bugbear? In fact, the whole Article, with all its learning and ingenuity, reminds one of those sophistical chains of logic, by which it is proved incontrovertibly that motion is an impossibility; whereto a man bound hand and foot might whine a melancholy assent: but let him loose, and he will sweep away the logical web in the most conclusive manner, by moving. Was it not demonstrated of yore, what a flood of evils would flow in upon us from the use of tobacco, and from that of tea? how the English character was to be destroyed by them, and the strength and power of England to be undermined? and has it not been proved, by this man and that, how impossible it is to eat or to drink, even to eat bread and drink water, without

swallowing all manner of deaths? Yet still we eat and drink, and, in despite thereof, are alive. In truth it almost seems to be a peculiarity of the English character, to be prodigal and inexhaustible in the prognostication of evil. Hardly a change in our institutions is proposed, but a number of persons take alarm, and predict that the prosperity and glory of England will be ruined thereby; while others are no less confident that, unless the corruptions of our existing institutions are remedied, we must infallibly perish. Thus, in a letter written by the first Pitt in the year 1741, we find him saying, "I think the scene abroad a most gloomy one. Whether day is ever to break forth again, or destruction and darkness is finally to cover all,—*Impiaque aeternam meruerunt saecula noctem*,—must soon be determined." Such a letter might have been written when Attila was overrunning Europe: yet we, a century after, have to search, in order to find out from what quarter any danger could be lookt for in 1741. Doubtless too there has scarcely been a year since, when similar disasters have not been apprehended: nor does the failure of a hundred such prophecies incline the prophets to distrust the hundred and first. Therefore, although so many evils are foreboded by some from the meeting of our Convocation, we need not be appalled thereby. If we meet in faith, with the desire to do our duty, and to build up the Church in the beauty of holiness, the light of heaven will shine upon our path; and the clouds, which may seem to threaten, will be dispelled.

Nevertheless I am far from contending that the constitution of our Convocation is exactly what one should desire for a Council designed to discuss the momentous questions which would call for the consideration of an Ecclesiastical Government, were any such existing in these days. Some strong objections to it have been urged in *the English Review* for October, 1844; but the substitute there proposed would much rather increase than remove what is most defective in the present form. The writer recommends that the government of the Church should be committed to a Synod of Bishops,—a certain number of other clergymen eminent for learning, and of canonists, being admitted as advisers, but without

votes; and, if this were done, he holds, "nothing would be left to desire." Now such a Government would not be very acceptable to anybody, except to those who fancy that all the wisdom and all the power of the Church is centred in the Episcopate; and most of these would soon be disabused of that notion, when they found the wisdom of the Episcopate at variance with their own: least of all would it find favour with the Bishops themselves. Some of the reasons which tell with conclusive force against such a Synod, are pointed out by Dr Biber in his valuable pamphlet on the Supremacy, pp. 108—112; and several others, were it needful, might be added. Indeed, if we attend to the lessons afforded by divers recent proceedings in the University of Oxford, and call to mind how the measures proposed by the Heads of Houses have been rejected time after time by an overpowering majority, we may perceive that a body, which certainly does not possess greater advantages for ascertaining the mind and will of the Church, and what would best tend to build up all classes of her members in wealth and peace and godliness, would be little likely to secure any general concurrence and submission for its decisions. They themselves too would doubtless shrink from the arduous and perilous responsibility. But the only argument, which is, or can be adduced in behalf of such a proposition,—its being in accordance with primitive usage,—will not hold water. All the evidence that can be drawn from the New Testament is against it. He who has a complaint against a brother, is to bring it before the Ecclesia: Matt. xviii. 17. The incestuous person at Corinth is to be cast out by the Ecclesia: 1 Cor. v. 4. Even the Apostles themselves, at the Council of Jerusalem, did not think fit to decide the great questions proposed to them, unless with the concurrence of *the elders*, and of *the whole Church*: Acts xv. 22, 23. Nor did they proceed to the election of a new Apostle, in the place of Judas, except *in the midst of the disciples*: Acts i. 15. So, when the new order of deacons was appointed, they were chosen *by the whole multitude*: Acts vi. 5.* From these

* These passages were much canvast during the controversies about Church-Government, which were carried on with such pertinacity

indications we may learn that the supreme authority in the primitive Church was vested in the Ecclesia,—not indeed as an unorganized mass, deciding questions numerically,—but with due regard to the various classes of which it was composed, none of these being destitute of a voice. That remains of this form of government were subsisting down to the middle of the third century, is clear

during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and according to custom each party strained them in its own favour, so that neither learnt what they teach. Jeremy Taylor, whose ingenuity had overlaid his love of truth when he wrote his Treatise on Episcopacy, has recourse to every shift in order to reconcile the report of the Council in the Acts with his position that "Bishops only did vote in Councils, and neither Presbyters nor People.—Although (he says, § 41)—we find no man giving sentence but Peter and James, yet in xvi. 4 they are called *δόγματα κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*.—But first, in this the difficulty is the less, because *presbyter* was a general word for all that were not of the number of the twelve, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and doctors. And then, secondly, it is none at all, because Paul and Barnabas are signally and by name reckoned as present in the synod, and one of them prolocutor, or else both: *so that such presbyters may well define in such conventual assemblies.*" Can Taylor have read over the account in the 15th chapter,—how it was determined that Paul and Barnabas—*should go up to Jerusalem to the Apostles and Elders about this question* (v. 2);—how, when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received *by the Ecclesia, and by the Apostles and Elders* (v. 4);—how, when an opposition was excited in the Ecclesia by some converts from among the Pharisees, *the Apostles and Elders* took counsel together, and then, after a long discussion, Peter addrest the brethren, and obtained a hearing for Barnabas and Paul;—how, after Paul and Barnabas had declared what wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them, James proposed the decision which had been agreed upon, and which was adopted *by the Apostles and the Elders, along with the whole Ecclesia;*—and how, in consequence of this decision, *the Apostles and the Elders* wrote to the brethren at Antioch;—is it possible, I say, that so acute a man as Taylor, after reading this account, can have believed that Paul and Barnabas were especially the Elders whose names are coupled with those of the Apostles in issuing this decision? Were Paul and Barnabas then the Elders, whom, as we are told in the 2nd verse, they, Paul and Barnabas, went to Jerusalem to consult, and by whom they were received, v. 4? Clearsighted as Taylor is, when he has no prejudices to delude him, he often in this work reminds one of the saying, that *none are so blind as those who won't see.* He proceeds, "I remember also that this place is pretended for the

from a number of passages in Cyprian's Letters. Thus in the 5th, written during his retirement from Carthage to the Presbyters and Deacons, he says, that, being alone, he had been unable to reply to the application of his co-presbyters, "quando a primordio episcopatus mei statuerim *nihil sine consilio vestro et sine consensu plebis*—(λαοῦ, of the laity)—*mea privatim sententia gerere.* Sed

people's power of voicing in councils.—The pretense is in the synodal letter written in the name *of the Apostles and Elders and Brethren;* that is, says Geta, the Apostles and Presbyters and People. *But why not Brethren? that is, all the deacons, and evangelists, and helpers in government, and ministers of the churches?* There is nothing, either in words or circumstances, to contradict this. If it be askt, who then are meant by *Elders,* if by *Brethren* St Luke understands these church-officers? I answer, that here is such variety that, although I am not certain which officers he precisely comprehends under the distinct titles of *Elders* and *Brethren, yet here are enough to furnish both with variety,—and yet neither to admit mere Presbyters, in the present acceptation of the word, nor yet the Laity, to a decision of the question,* nor authorizing the decretal. For, besides the twelve Apostles, *there were apostolical men, which were Presbyters, and something more,—and evangelists and pastors besides, which might furnish out the last appellative sufficiently.*" It is melancholy to see so great and good a man betaking himself to such quibbling attempts to elude the plain meaning of words. Taylor does not state the matter fairly, in saying that "the pretense—for the people's power of voicing in councils,—is in the synodal letter." That letter receives its interpretation from the preceding verse, which he passes over, and which even his dexterity would not have easily twisted to his purpose: *τότε ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.* If the common reading in v. 23, *οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ,* is correct, it seems plain that the last clause answers to the last of the three clauses in v. 22, *σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.* Had Taylor known what strong authority there is for the reading which Lachmann has adopted, *οἱ ἀποστόλοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοὶ,* he would have escaped the temptation for his evasions. But, in spite of that strong authority, it seems likely that, as Vater suggests, the text may have been altered in order to bring it into nearer agreement with the later form of synodal letters; and *ἀδελφοὶ* is awkward and needless, if subjoined immediately to *πρεσβύτεροι.* Still at all events, though the decision was ratified by the whole Ecclesia, the letter might proceed merely from the Apostles and Elders.

Hammond, who treats on this passage in a note on Acts vi. 2, shews more candour, though he foists in his strange notion that

cum ad vos per Dei gratiam venero, *tunc de iis quae vel gesta sunt vel gerenda,* sicut honor mutuus poscit, *in commune tractabimus.*" For assuredly we are not to infer from these words, that the Presbyters in the New Testament are Bishops, a notion only true in a different sense, namely, that there is no distinction between the two orders; wherefore the modern maintainers of the primitive institution of Episcopacy rather trace it to the Apostolate, than to the Presbyterate. "In the Council at Jerusalem (he says), with the Apostles and Elders, or Bishops of Judea, is joined ὅλη ἐκκλησία, *the whole Church,* in the choosing and sending messengers to Antioch, but that with a most discernible distinction. The Apostles and Elders, as they whose decree or appointment it was,—ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ πρεσβυτέροις, — *it pleased or seemed good to the Apostles and Elders to send chosen men,* the choice and mission belonging to them, and the persons sent ἄνδρες ἐξ αὐτῶν *men of them,* Bishops of the Council, but this with the knowledge and approbation of the whole Church, σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, joined with them, as of those that were accessories, not principals, in the sending. So in the inscription of the epistle of the Council,—*The Apostles and Elders and Brethren send greeting.* Not that any but the Apostles and Elders, that is, Bishops of Judea, were members of the Council, or had voices in it (for that is cleared v. 6, at the first mention of their convening,—*The Apostles and Elders came together to consider of this matter,*—the debate of the question, and the decision, belonging only to them); but that the whole Church joined with the Apostles and Bishops, shewing their consent and approbation and submission to the decree of the Council. And thus in following times have Laymen subscribed the Acts of Councils in this form, *Consentiens subscripsi, I have subscribed consenting,* or testified my consent under my hand. As for the decree of the Council, though that be in the style of ἡμῖν, *us,* v. 28, which may be conceived to refer to all those that are named in the front, and so to the ἀδελφοὶ, *brethren,* yet 'tis apparent by v. 25, ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδὸν, *it seemed to us being assembled together,* that that belongs only to those that were assembled or sat in the Council, that is, the Apostles and Elders, v. 6; and so it is expressly set, c. xvi. 4, δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων." I said that Hammond shews more candour than Taylor; but perhaps, if one observes how every expression is strained, in order to avoid recognising its natural import when unfavorable to his prepossessions, it would be more correct to say that he is less ingenious, and therefore seems less sophistical. If we look at the passage with an unprejudiced eye, it is clear that ἐκλεξομένους, in v. 22, refers to all the

the rule which Cyprian had laid down for himself was an innovation of his own, at variance with ancient usage; though they certainly seem to imply that all the bishops in his day were not

three classes just mentioned: it was determined by the Apostles and Elders, along with the whole Church, *that they would choose*, not that the Apostles and Elders should choose, but that they should do so along with the whole Church, according to the mode adopted in the election of the first Deacons. Nor is ἐξ αὐτῶν added to signify that the men so elected were to be taken from among the Apostles and Elders,—to say nothing of those apocryphal personages, "the Bishops of the Council,"—but that it was resolved to send messengers out of their own body, from among the brethren at Jerusalem, to those at Antioch, as well as a letter. Nor assuredly is the discussion spoken of in the 6th verse the one main act of the Council, as Hammond would represent it, so that ἡμῖν in v. 28, and ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδὸν in v. 25 should refer merely to the preliminary discussion among the Apostles and Elders. If we read the whole story connectedly, it appears that, when the opposition was excited by the Pharisaic converts, in consequence of what Paul and Barnabas declared to the Ecclesia, the Apostles and Elders gathered together, perhaps retired, to consider what was to be done, and then returned, probably to the same Ecclesia, and set forth the conclusion they had come to, which was adopted by the whole assembly ὁμοθυμαδόν.

On the other hand we may readily agree with Thorndike, a man of far subtiler intellect than Hammond, of subtiler perhaps even than Taylor, though no way comparable to him in the regions of fancy and feeling, that "the arrow is shot beyond the mark, when it is argued that this decree (of the Council of Jerusalem) is the act of the people, because it appears that they assent to it, seeing that they were bound to consent to the acts of the Apostles:" (*Right of the Church in a Christian State, c. ii.* §. 34). But when he proceeds, in §. 38, to argue, that, "as no water can ascend higher than it descended afore, so can no people have any further right and power in Church matters than that which the people had under the Apostles, because that is all the evidence upon which their interests can be grounded and acknowledged,"—we perceive that even he, though he seems to have been really desirous of attaining to some stable truth, amid the raging cross-currents of conflicting opinions, and though he exercises a critical discrimination beyond the common measure of his age, yet could not avoid the errour he speaks of at the beginning of his *Discourse of the Government of Churches*: "If we put the grains of affection and prejudice into the gold-scales which we weigh

equally scrupulous in conforming to it. With the lofty notions of the sacerdotal and episcopal dignity, which he manifests in other places, he would never have subjected that authority of his own

nice truths with, no marvel if the lighter go down." For, to look no further, as the obligation on the part of the people to submit to the decree of the Apostles arose, according to Thorndike's own view, from the relative position of the two bodies, when that relative position becomes wholly different, and the Episcopate or Clergy no longer have the same immeasurable superiority or unparallcled claims to submission, and the Laity are, intellectually at least, a body far superior to the Congregation at Jerusalem, *cadit consequentia et argumentum*, In like manner, it seems to me, unless his vision had been dimmed by his desire of cutting down the privileges of the Laity to a minimum, he would hardly have maintained in the last-mentioned *Discourse* (c. xii. §. 18), that the loss of the right which the people exercised in the election of the first deacons, is more than made up for by the practice which "the people of this Church useth at the present, though not in themselves, yet in the patrons of churches, to whom the Church yieldeth it, in the name of the people, in respect to the merit of those that built or endowed churches." For it is not easy to understand how the appointment of a minister by a patron, often a total stranger to the parish, and who will mostly be influenced in the main by personal considerations, can be an amends to the Congregation for no longer having the power of electing the minister most acceptable to them, even granting that this election were subject to an episcopal veto. Again, without this bias, Thorndike would not have contended, as he does in the same *Discourse*, c. xi. §§. 13, 14, and in his *Right of the Church*, c. ii. §. 34,—that, in the passage about the incestuous person (in 1 Cor. v.), St Paul merely calls upon the Ecclesia "to see his sentence publisht, ratified, and executed," and does not imply that the Congregation had any authority in themselves to cast out the offending member. For the passage plainly shews that the power of *judging those who were within*, their own members, was vested in the Ecclesia, —not in the Presbyters, to whom Thorndike ascribes it, but of whom no mention is made; and St Paul expostulates with them for not having exercised that power.

It is curious that Hooker, when he is maintaining the right proposition, that the Laity ought to have a voice in legislating for the Church, should cite the Council of Jerusalem, as though the report of it were unfavorable to his proposition, and should merely answer, "that the Council of Jerusalem is no argument for the power of the Clergy

accord to the controll of the Laity; but his sense of justice would lead him to maintain an ancient institution, even at his own cost, when others might be disposed to violate it. That it was agreeable to ancient discipline, appears from his 13th Letter, *Ad Clerum*. "Hoc enim et verecundiae et *disciplinae* et vitae ipsi omnium nostrum *convenit*, ut praepositi cum clero convenientes, *praesente etiam stantium plebe, quibus et ipsis pro fide et timore suo honor habendus est, disponere omnia consilii communis religione possimus.*' In like manner, in his 11th letter, *Ad Plebem*, concerning those who had lapst, he says: "Cum pace nobis omnibus a Domino prius data ad Ecclesiam regredi coeperimus, tunc examinabuntur singula *praesentibus et judicantibus vobis*;" and, a little after, he begs them to wait for his return, "ut, cum ad vos per Dei misericordiam venerimus, convocati coepiscopi plures, *secundum Domini disciplinam et confessorum praesentiam et vestram quoque sententiam*, beatorum martyrum literas et desideria examinare possimus." Again in his 27th letter, *Ad Clerum*, with reference to a similar question, he writes: "Cui rei non potui me solum judicem dare, cum multi adhuc de clero absentes sint,—et haec singulorum tractanda sit et limanda plenius ratio, non tantum cum collegis meis, *sed et cum plebe ipsa universa*." So too, in the 25th Letter, from the Roman Confessors to Cyprian, it is acknowledged that these questions ought "caute moderateque tractari, *consultis omnibus episcopis, presbyteris, diaconibus, confessoribus, et ipsis stantibus laicis*." Again the Roman Clergy, in the 30th Letter, express their approbation of this course, "Collatione consiliorum

alone to make laws. For first, there hath not been sithence any Council of like authority to that in Jerusalem. Secondly, the cause why that was of such authority came by a special accident. Thirdly, the reason why, other Councils being not like unto that in nature, the Clergy in them should have no power to make laws by themselves alone, is in truth so forcible, that, except some commandment of God to the contrary can be shewed, it ought notwithstanding the foresaid example to prevail:" B. VIII. c. vi. §. 7. Cogent and conclusive as these reasons would be, if they were needed, it is strange that Hooker, even in this unfinisht draft of the Eighth Book, should have overlookt that the Council of Jerusalem was not a precedent against him, but decisively in his favour.

cum episcopis, presbyteris, diaconis, *confessoribus pariter ac stantibus laicis* facta, lapsorum tractare rationem."* Other passages confirmatory of these might be added; but these are more than

* Hence we see with what one-eyed vision Thorndike must have read Cyprian's Epistles, when he said, in his Treatise *Of Religious Assemblies*, c. IV. §. 13, that they who gave the people "right of deciding controversies, because they are mentioned in the Council at Jerusalem,—may please to consider St Cyprian's order, *which alloweth their presence for their satisfaction, not their voices to decide:* as they are present at Councils, but not called to give sentence." The reason why their presence was allowed, he conceives to be "in regard of the execution and effect which the sentence of the Bishop or ecclesiastical order then found by the consent of the people, when the law enforced it not." This, he supposes, was the reason why St Paul wrote to the Ecclesia at Corinth about the expulsion of the incestuous person; and he adds: "But since Kingdoms and Commonwealths are become Christian, the laws of those Kingdoms and Commonwealths, as they enforce the ministers of the Church to execute their office according to such rules as they enforce, so they constrain the people to yield outward effect to the same." This is a wretchedly low view of polity, especially of ecclesiastical polity. It is true, necessity has often been the occasion whereby the right principles of government have first gained their outward expression and recognition: the laws of the outward world continually compell man to acknowledge and bow down to the laws of the inward world, when he would otherwise set up his selfwill in opposition to them. But it is strange that a writer, professing a deep reverence for the polity of the Church, and for its authors, should lay down that St Paul and Cyprian merely admitted the Laity to have an influence in the Ecclesia for the sake of carrying their point, as a temporary expedient, without reference to any higher principle. Nor is his historical position, that Cyprian "alloweth their presence for their satisfaction, not their voices to decide," better grounded than his theoretical one. The passages quoted in the text, especially those from the 11th letter, *Ad plebem*,—which naturally are more explicit than the others, though all the others, if compared therewith, are plainly seen to coincide with them,—declare that Cyprian intended to proceed according to the *sententia* of the Laity, the Laity *praesentibus et judicantibus*. For an unprejudiced scholar will hardly imagine that *judicare* here is used in the sense which Jeremy Taylor, in the passage cited in the last Note, ascribes to it in a similar expression: "Therefore Councils were always kept in open churches, *ubi populus judicat*, not for others, but for

enough to prove that the Laity, in Cyprian's days, had a voice in the discussion and decision of such questions as came, not only before the Diocesan, but also before the Provincial Synod.

It is true, in the report of the Synod held at Carthage in the year 256, to pronounce on the validity of baptism by heretics,—as that report is printed along with Cyprian's works,—after reading that a number of Bishops had assembled, *cum presbyteris et diaconibus, praesente etiam plebis maxima parte*, we find nothing but a record of the opinions of the eighty-seven Bishops, all agreeing in denying its validity, and asserting that they who have received this baptism must be rebaptized on their admission into the Catholic Church. On the strength of this, and of a couple of other equally conclusive statements, the English Reviewer asserts (p. 37), that, though "priests and deacons were frequently present at Councils,—they took no part in the proceedings, except on special invitation from the bishops so to do,"—that "they came with their bishops to assist with advice, if called upon, but not empowered with any right of suffrage;" and the same thing he maintains *a fortiori* concerning the laity. This is a sample of the rash uncritical manner in which our admirers of ecclesiastical antiquity snatch up their conclusions with regard to the ancient doctrines and practice of the Church. They find two or three statements which seem to coincide with their own previous notions; and straightway they proclaim that those notions have the sanction of all ecclesiastical antiquity. An attempt should at least have been made to explain the apparent discrepancy between this passage and those previously quoted from Cyprian's Letters, where it is explicitly asserted that the inferior clergy and the laity were to take part in the deliberations, both by delivering their opinions and judicially. But, if we examine the report of the Council of

themselves, not by external sentence, but internal conviction." Institutions in their origin are not such mere shadows, though they may become so in their decadence. The sound tree does not grow by the filling up of the hollow tree; though the hollow tree may live for scores of years, and even for centuries, after the heart of the sound tree has crumbled away.

Carthage, we find it was not convened for the purpose of coming to any decision, but merely in order that the Bishops should deliver their opinions in succession. Thus Cyprian states in his introductory speech addrest to his brother Bishops: "Superest ut de hac re singuli quid sentiamus proferamus, neminem judicantes, aut a jure communicationis aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes. Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se esse episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit.—Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem et praeponendi nos in Ecclesiae suae gubernatione, et de actu nostro judicandi." In these words he is manifestly referring to the despotical assumption of the Roman Bishop Stephanus, who was endeavouring to enforce his opposite conclusion by excommunicating the Asiatic Bishops for differing from it. So that, as the Synod carefully abstains from deciding anything, of course the inferior clergy could not take part in any decision. It was a matter in which the Bishops merely delivered their opinions in order, as our Judges do when called in by the House of Lords.

At the same time it is plain, from a number of indications in Cyprian's letters, that the Clergy had already begun to overshadow the Laity, and to curtail their rightful authority in the Church; while the Episcopate on its part was in like manner overshadowing both the Laity and the Clergy, and was gradually drawing the whole power to itself. In this age too do we discern the first germs of the subsequent pretensions of the Papacy. Thus each class, while it designed to strengthen itself, really weakened itself, by its usurpations, and, from losing the support of those below, became less able to resist the encroachments of those who were above it. In acting thus, the Episcopate may often have had no intention, or even consciousness, of usurping what did not belong to it, and was assuredly not influenced solely by personal ambition. A benevolent zeal would lead it to exert that authority, which in times of struggle and persecution would readily be conceded to persons occupying the position of the chief shepherds and guides of their flock. In such cases energy and fortitude invest a

man with power, which he has no set purpose of assuming. But unhappily that, which in the first instance is done unobjectionably, under the pressure of circumstances, is afterwards regarded as a precedent, and claimed as a right. It would be an interesting enquiry, if a scholar, duly qualified with learning and critical discrimination, endeavoured to ascertain what traces the history of the Church in later ages still affords of the influence originally exercised by the Laity, and to describe the progress of the encroachments whereby they were deprived of their full Christian franchise. With regard to Synods, it would seem as though one cause, which led to the exclusion of the Laity from them, was the practice of convening Ecumenical Councils, which grew up immediately after the adoption of Christianity as the religion of the Empire. For various reasons would render it inexpedient that more than one deputy should come from each Diocese to the Council; and this would of course be the Bishop, who, so long as he was elected by the clergy and people, would also be in every sense their fittest representative. Moreover, as the only proper ground for convening an Ecumenical Council is to determine the fundamental principles of the faith, when these are assailed by wide-spread heresies, this especially belonged to the province of the Bishops, as the chief depositaries of the knowledge and traditions of the Church. On such questions very few laymen were in those days fitted to pronounce. If in the lower orders of the Clergy any were particularly eminent for learning and wisdom, they too might be specially summoned to the Synod, as Athanasius, while a deacon, was to the Council of Nicea. But even the Ecumenical Councils did not consist purely of Bishops or of Clergy. The Emperor, who presided in them in person or by deputy, stood in place of the Laity; and without this addition the decrees of the Council, after the Church became a national one, would no longer have been binding.

Now this is the great defect in the constitution of our Convocation: it represents the Conscience and Will, and expresses the voice of the Clergy, not of the Church. This was suited to its original function of imposing taxes on the Clergy, but unfits it for being the legislative Council of the whole Church. Hence Lord

Hardwicke's celebrated decision is no less valid on grounds of true ecclesiastical polity, than of constitutional law. The acts of the Convocation, as at present constituted, ought not to be deemed binding, except upon the Clergy, until they have received the sanction of Parliament. It is mainly owing to this defect, that Ecclesiastical Councils have fallen into such disuse in the whole Western Church since the age of the Reformation. The rights, which, we have seen, the Laity must originally have possest in the assemblies of the Church, were greatly impaired as early as in the fourth century, and appear even then to have become little more than a shadow. This, as has already been remarkt, was in no small measure the result of the Ecumenical Councils, in the Canons of which, enjoining annual meetings of Synods, they are merely termed Synods of Bishops. Still there is a great body of evidence shewing that for several centuries the Laity, as well as the lower orders of the Clergy, often, if not generally, took part in them, or at least were present. Thus, in the Acts of the Council of Eliberis, at the beginning of the fourth century, after the names of the Bishops who were present, we have those of a number of Presbyters; and then it is added, "Residentibus cunctis, (that is, all the Bishops and Presbyters), *adstantibus diaconibus et omni plebe*, episcopi universi dixerunt." At the first Council of Toledo, in the year 435, we read, "Convenientibus episcopis,—*considentibus presbyteris, adstantibus diaconibus, et ceteris qui intererant concilio congregatis*, Patruinus episcopus dixit." At the third Council of Toledo, in 627, "Post confessionem et subscriptionem omnium episcoporum *et totius gentis Gothicae seniorum*,"—King Recared addresses them. And in the 18th Canon of that Council it is ordered that the Bishops should assemble once a year, "*judices vero locorum, vel actores fiscalium patrimoniorum—simul cum sacerdotali concilio—in unum conveniant.*" At the fourth Council of Toledo in 671, the 4th Canon regulates how the Bishops are first to enter the assembly, then the Presbyters, *quos causa probaverit introire*, then, *diacones probabiles, quos ordo poposcerit interesse,—deinde ingrediantur laici, qui electione concilii interesse meruerint.* At the Council of Tarragona

in 516, the 13th Canon enjoins that the Bishops, *non solum a cathedralibus ecclesiis presbyteros, verum etiam de dioecesanis ad concilium trahant, et aliquos de filiis ecclesiae saecularibus secum adducere debeant.* In like manner the 10th Canon of the Council of Riez, in 439, on the annual assembling of Councils, enacts that *in ipsis conciliis et presbyteros et diaconos et judices sive curiales ac privatos praesentes esse oportet.*

It would require far more learning, and a much larger command of books, than I have at hand, to carry out this investigation, and to shew how and when and through what immediate causes the Laity and the lower Clergy were deprived of their synodical franchise in the various branches of the Church, how they first lost their influence on the decisions of the Councils, and were then at length excluded from the meetings also. For that this was the process which took place, seems scarcely doubtful; though Archbishop Wake, in arguing against Atterbury (in his *State of the Church and Clergy of England.* pp. 96 — 116), tries to make out that it was just the reverse, that the whole authority in the Councils of the Church rested originally with the Bishops, and that the change, by which Abbots and Priors first, then Cathedral Dignitaries, and lastly ordinary Presbyters obtained a voice in them, was "an encroachment of later ages." For it is hardly conceivable that a practice, which was so long and widely prevalent, should have gained this footing, and should even have been sanctioned by express regulations concerning it, unless it had at one time been accompanied by some real power. The shadow of an institution may subsist for many generations after the reality has past away, as has been seen over and over again in all long-lived nations; for instance, in the retention of the assembly of the Roman Curies for centuries after the whole system to which they belonged had been remodeled: and this is especially the case with regard to the Church, of all corporations the most permanent, and everything pertaining to which has a peculiar sanctity. Thus our Houses of Convocation still continue to assemble, though their assembling has for a century and a quarter been almost as much a mere form,

as the challenge offered by the Champion at the Coronation. Unless however there had at one time been a reality, there would hardly have been such an abiding shadow. To suppose that the Lower Clergy and the Laity merely came to the Councils as spectators and hearers, is as implausible a notion, as that the two Houses of Convocation merely assemble to witness the meeting of Parliament. Nor does the solution proposed by Wake and others, that, when any members of the Lower Clergy are mentioned as having been present, they had been specially summoned on account of business in which they were personally concerned, seem applicable to the majority of cases. Nor again does the fact, that the Bishops alone mostly signed the Acts of the Council, prove that the whole power was vested in them: at almost all public meetings the reports of the proceedings are merely signed by the presidents. And though ordinarily the Bishops alone spoke, so did the Kings alone in the Homeric assemblies; yet this did not render the assent, the *ἐπενφημία*, if I may coin such a word, of the people a nullity. The speakers in public assemblies will naturally come in most cases out of certain classes, especially in earlier ages, before the great body of the people have learnt to feel their intellectual and moral and political importance. Of such a kind would seem to have been the primitive form of the Councils of the Church. The approbation and consent, the *ἐπενφημία*, of the people gave a binding force to the ordinances proposed to them. This point is well stated by Field, in his excellent Treatise *Of the Church*, (B. v. c. 49), where, speaking of the persons who were present at the General Councils, he says, that they are "of divers sorts. For some are there with authority to teach, define, prescribe, and to direct: others are there to hear, set forward, and consent to that which is there to be done. In the former sort none but only Ministers of the word and sacraments are present in Councils; and they only have deciding and defining voices: but in the latter sort Laymen also may be present. Whereupon we shall find that Bishops and Presbyters subscribe in this sort: *Ego N. definiens, subscripsi;* that is, I, as having power to define and decree, have subscribed. But the Emperor, or any other lay

person, *Ego N. consentiens, subscripsi;* that is, I, as one giving consent to that which is agreed on by the spiritual pastors, have subscribed. That the Emperor and other Laymen of place and sort may be present in General Councils, no man maketh doubt. For though Pope Nicolas seem to deny that the Emperors may be present in other Councils, where matters of faith are not handled, yet he confesseth they may be present in General Councils, where the faith, which is common to all, and pertaineth not to clergymen alone, but to laymen and all Christians generally, is treated of; it being a rule in nature and reason, *Quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus tractari debere;* that is, that that which concerneth all, may be handled and meddled with by all, so far forth as conveniently it may, and as there is no manifest reason, in respect of the disturbance and hinderance of the deliberation, to repell them from such intermeddling."

That the Laity, having once enjoyed this right, should have lost it, will not seem unaccountable to any one who calls to mind how in the course of ages one Christian privilege after another was wrested from them, even that of reading the Bible, and the Cup in the Eucharist. Of course, among the causes which combined in bringing about this result, a part arose from the condition of the Laity, moral and intellectual. When almost all the intellectual cultivation and all the theological knowledge in the Church were confined to the Clergy, it seemed in accordance with that equity, which, however unconsciously, exercises an incalculable influence in reconciling men to social institutions, that the decision of questions requiring much knowledge and skill should be committed to the possessors of those rare qualities. But after the Reformation, when Samson had entered the city of Knowledge, and had carried off the gates along with him, so that all men might freely enter after him, and no one could any longer bar them out,—when knowledge thus grew to be more and more generally diffused, and was no longer restricted to a privileged class, — when the Bible was thrown open to the Laity, and it became inevitable that thoughtful laymen would meditate and speculate upon divine things, as well as upon human,—it

ceast to be possible that a body selected from one part of the Church should be regarded and submitted to as the legitimate representative and organ of the whole. Hence even the Church of Rome has closed the long series of her Councils with that of Trent; though in her the objections just mentioned have far less force than among Protestants, and are smothered and suppress, instead of being allowed to grow up freely. In Protestant Churches on the other hand, it has been found impossible to uphold the authority of a Synod, except where the Laity have resumed their rightful place in it; as in the National Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and in the American Convocation. An additional proof how urgently this is required by the mind of the Church in our days, has been afforded by the recent proceedings in Prussia; where, when the Provincial Synods assembled two years ago, to consider what would be the best form for the National Synod which their great and good King purpost to convoke, the only point, I am informed, on which all the Provincial Synods concurred, was in expressing an earnest desire that their Lay brethren should be summoned along with the Clergy. In our own Church too, if we are to have a really efficient Ecclesiastical Synod, the Laity must form part of it. They are indispensable primarily, because of right they ought to be there; and right is the only sure and lasting ground of power: all the excuses for the usurpation which excluded them have vanisht. They are indispensable, in order to gain weight for the decisions of the Synod, and to obtain the concurrence and sympathy of the great body of the Church, which would look with jealousy on the proceedings of a merely clerical Council. They are requisite, in order to give a sound practical character to our deliberations: for, though some of the causes which led Clarendon to pronounce that clergymen "understand the least, and take the worst measure of human affairs, of all mankind that can write and read" (*Life* V. I. p. 74), may be less operative now than two centuries ago, from the greater intercourse and fusion between the various classes of society, still one cannot feel sure that he would altogether retract this opinion, were he living in our days. They are requisite,

to keep us from wasting our time in dogmatical disputes, and to preserve us from the noxious influence of those idols of the theatre, which no class is proner to worship.

How far this necessity may be apprehended and appreciated by those amongst us who are most anxious for an Ecclesiastical Synod, I know not. Archbishop Whately indeed, who has taken the most active part in endeavouring to obtain one, says, in a Note to his *Kingdom of Christ* (p. 266), that "if the Laity are admitted to a share in the government of the Church, and to ecclesiastical offices, this would be not only allowable, but wise and right. That laymen,—that is, those who hold no *spiritual* office, —should take part in legislating for the Church, and should hold ecclesiastical offices, as in the Scotch Kirk, and in the American Episcopalian Church, (always supposing however that they are members of the Church, not, as in this country, belonging to other communions) is far better than that the whole government should be in the hands of men of one profession, the Clerical."

Dr Biber also, in his Pamphlet *On the Supremacy*, to which I have already referred, while he forcibly urges the need of an Ecclesiastical Legislature, rightly insists that the Laity ought to take part in it (p. 117), shewing that this would be agreeable to primitive usage (p. 106), and to the practice of the British and Anglo-Saxon Churches, pp. 48—60.

The Bishop of Oxford again, who, as Archdeacon of Surrey, was one of the most prominent among the members of the last Convocation in endeavouring to obtain some expression of our desire for the revival of the deliberative Council of the Church, when he is speaking of the first meeting of the American Convocation, in his History of the American Church, says (p. 220): "It was gathered together in the full likeness of that Council, to which *the Apostles and Elders came together at Jerusalem.* For now, as then, it met with bishops at its head, with presbyters and deacons, each in their own order, ministering under them, and with the laity, *the multitude of the faithful,* taking solemn counsel for the welfare of their Zion." And again, in p. 254: "Some indeed there were,—who contended that laymen should not sit at all

in Synods of the Church. But for this there seems to be undoubted warrant. From the intimations of the Acts of the Apostles, we can hardly doubt that, in some way or other, the laity took part in the discussions of the primitive Church. It is as plain that they made up the body in which dwelt the Holy Ghost, as that the power of discipline and rule was vested in the hands of the Apostles. The general history of the Church in the succeeding age suggests, that then also the believing people ratified with their exprest consent the decisions of the earliest synods. That such was the custom in our own land, is clear from plain historical records. It is proved by the earliest remains of our annals, that the bishops presided over ecclesiastical Councils in England, and, with a vast attendance of the people, settled all matters of religion against heresies. After the subjugation of this island by the Saxons, their kings, with the chiefs and bishops, held councils, in which they decided all which concerned the safety of the Church and kingdom, and, to maintain their peace and discipline, enacted laws, with the sanction both of the laity and prelates. Further, if at any time canons were past in a merely ecclesiastical Synod, they were not binding on the body of the clergy, until they had received the sanction of the monarch, as the representative of the laity; for no decrees of ecclesiastical Councils possest the character of public enactments, until thus sanctioned by the king's authority. Both in Scotland and England, in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, councils were held for settling both civil and ecclesiastical affairs; in which it is plain, from their signatures, that kings and great men of the laity sat with and even outweighed the bishops. On this point our ancient records cannot be mistaken. 'Let the Bishop and the senator' say the laws of Edgar, about A.D. 950, 'be present at the provincial synod; and afterwards let them teach divine and human laws.'—'King Eadmund,' says the code of Anglo-Saxon laws, 'assembled a great synod at London-byrig, as well of ecclesiastical as secular degree, during the holy Easter-tide.'—'In the reign of—Wihtred,—there was assembled a convention of the great men in council. There was Birhtwald, archbishop of Britain, and the

forenamed king, and the ecclesiastics of the province of every degree spoke in union with the subject people.' So speak the laws of King Alfred. 'After this it happened that many nations received the faith of Christ, and that many synods were assembled throughout all the earth, and also among the English race,—of holy bishops, and also of other exalted witan.' And even in later times, when the clergy and laity no longer sat together, the decisions of the synod were ratified by the assent of the assembled laity. It is not therefore to the presence or votes of the laity in the American Convention, that objection can be made. In this respect the constitution of the synod did but follow primitive examples." It is very satisfactory to find so clear and decided a conviction on this point in a person whose character and abilities, and even his name, must needs give him a powerful influence in our ecclesiastical affairs.

To strengthen the foregoing arguments by the highest authority in our Church on matters of Ecclesiastical Polity, I will here add the following sentences from Hooker, whose largeness and freedom of mind raise him far above the polemical partisans, able as many of these were, in the succeeding century. "It is undoubtedly a thing even natural, that all free and independent societies should themselves make their own laws, and that this power should belong to the whole, not to any certain part of a politic body, though haply some one part may have greater sway in that action than the rest; which thing being generally fit and expedient in the making of all laws, we see no cause why to think otherwise in laws concerning the service of God; which in all well-ordered states and commonwealths is the first thing that law hath care to provide for. When we speak of the right which naturally belongeth to a commonwealth, we speak of that which needs must belong to the Church of God. For, if the commonwealth be Christian, if the people which are of it do publicly embrace the true religion, this very thing doth make it the Church, as hath been shewed. So that, unless the verity and purity of religion do take from them which embrace it that power wherewith otherwise they are possest, look, what authority, as touching laws for religion, a

commonwealth hath simply, it must of necessity, being Christian, have the same as touching laws for Christian religion: b. viii. c. vi. § 6." Then, after answering the objection which he supposed might be drawn from the Council at Jerusalem, as we have seen in the last note but one, he proceeds: "As now the state of the Church doth stand,—till it be proved that some special law of Christ hath for ever annext unto the Clergy alone the power to make ecclesiastical laws, we are to hold it a thing most consonant with equity and reason, that no ecclesiastical laws be made in a Christian commonwealth, without consent as well of the laity as of the clergy, but least of all without consent of the highest power.—In this case therefore that vulgar axiom is of force: *Quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus tractari et approbari debet.* Whereupon Pope Nicolas, although otherwise not admitting lay persons, no not emperors themselves, to be present at Synods, doth notwithstanding seem to allow of their presence when matters of faith are determined, whereunto all men must stand bound. *Ubinam legistis imperatores, antecessores vestros, synodalibus conventibus interfuisse? nisi forsitan in quibus de fide tractatum est, quae non solum ad clericos, verum etiam ad laicos et omnes pertinet Christianos.*—But were it so that the clergy alone might give laws unto all the rest, forasmuch as every estate doth desire to enlarge the bounds of their own liberties, is it not easy to see how injurious this might prove unto men of other condition?—Wherefore, of them which in this point attribute most to the clergy, I would demand what evidence there is, which way it may clearly be shewed, that, in ancient kingdoms Christian, any canon devised by the clergy alone in their synods, whether provincial, national, or general, hath by mere force of their agreement taken place as a law, making all men constrainable to be obedient thereunto, without any other approbation from the king before or afterwards required in that behalf?—There are which wonder that we should account any statute a law, which the high court of parliament in England hath established about the matter of church regiment; the prince and court of parliament having (as they suppose) no more lawful means to give order to the Church and clergy in these

things, than they have to make laws for the hierarchies of angels in heaven.—The most natural and religious course in making laws is, that the matter of them be taken from the judgement of the wisest in those things which they are to concern. In matters of God, to set down a form of public prayer, a solemn confession of the articles of Christian faith, rites and ceremonies meet for the exercise of religion, it were unnatural not to think the pastors and bishops of our souls a great deal more fit than men of secular trades and callings. Howbeit, when all which the wisdom of all sorts can do is done for devising of laws in the Church, it is the general consent of all that giveth them the form and vigour of laws, without which they could be no more unto us than the counsels of physicians to the sick. Well might they seem as wholesome admonitions and instructions; but laws could they never be without consent of the whole Church, which is the only thing that bindeth each member of the Church to be guided by them. Whereunto both nature and the practice of the Church of God set down in Scripture is found every way so fully consonant, that God Himself would not impose, no not His own laws upon His people by the hand of Moses, without their free and open consent." Here, as in other instances, this great teacher of political wisdom is maintaining those principles against the Puritans, which in our days need much rather to be maintained against the most violent adversaries of the Puritans.

As to the various practical questions of detail, which would necessarily arise with regard to the constitution and the procedure of a Synod composed jointly of the various orders of the Clergy and of the Laity, I cannot discuss them here. Doubtless there would be a good deal of difficulty in settling and adjusting them; and this is aggravated by our ignorance of the position and powers of the Laity in the Councils of former ages. But, as their relation to the Clergy is in many respects very different now, there must of course be a corresponding difference in their relation as members of a Synod. One indispensable condition, as Dr Biber rightly urges, would be

that, whatever mode of election were adopted, the elective power should be vested in the body of ordinary communicants, and, *a fortiori*, that the persons elected should be chosen out of that body. That the wisdom needful for such a work is not wholly wanting in these days, may be seen from the admirable scheme for the constitution of the Synods in the Prussian church, in M. Bunsen's Treatise on that subject: and as in all matters of practical policy we Englishmen boast to be, and, from the manifold experience which we have had for more than ten centuries, ought to be, superior to other nations, we may reasonably trust that these difficulties also would smoothe themselves away, if we were enabled to set to work in right earnest at finding out how to overcome them. After the convictions I have just been expressing, it may be deemed inconsistent to entertain any wish for the revival of our Convocation. That however seems to be the only way at present, in which our Church can attain to giving a general expression of her voice; and one may therefore wish for it, as the likeliest prelude and preparation for something better. The Bishop of Exeter, who, in his Charge for 1842, has spoken strongly on the want of an ecclesiastical Synod, has there remarkt (p. 43): "It is said that Convocation is not such a body, as is suited to synodal proceedings, that it was not originally constituted for a Synod, and that the progress of time had developed sources of very grave mischiefs inherent in its constitution. If so, it may be altered, and brought nearer to the model of the primitive Church, with such modifications as the existing state of things may demand. Surely it must be as safe to trust Convocation with the task of reforming its own constitution, as it has been found to trust other bodies in a similar work; and be it remembered that the Supremacy of the Crown, dutifully acknowledged by our Church even in its Articles, would be at all times ready to prevent or repress the mischiefs, which might arise from any exorbitant or unwise proceedings of such a body."

With regard to the objection which has been urged with much force by the Quarterly Reviewer, that, if we were allowed to meet for the transaction of business, we should assemble without any

experience, or any previous habits of debate, seeing that this objection, if it be allowed to check us, would be just as strong a hundred years hence as it is now, we may leave it to act upon those who hold that one must never attempt anything, because one cannot at first starting come forward as an accomplisht master. The maxim of practical wisdom however is not that we are never to try to swim until we can swim, but rather that by swimming we are to learn to swim. Nor would there be any benefit in our spending a score, or five score of years in practising in the sham-fights of a debating society. The battles in the early part of the French Revolution confirmed irresistibly, what previous experience might have taught, that such training is likelier to unfit, than to fit men for real war, the only efficient training for which is itself. Moreover our condition, with all its defects, is not quite so helpless as the Reviewer represents it. The Rural Chapters, which have lately been revived in several Dioceses, and the Diocesan Associations, which have been establisht, I believe, in almost all, supply us with occasions for meeting and transacting business in consort, at the latter along with our lay brethren, from whose presence we often derive invaluable assistance; and the questions which at such meetings we are led to discuss, though with a narrower aim, are not seldom of the same kind, as would come before an Ecclesiastical Synod.

Nor would I be daunted by that which has been held up in divers quarters to scare us, the fear of the public press. Though newspapers are the chief idols of the age, an idol has no power except over those who are infatuated enough to worship it. At the presence of an honest, righteous purpose, the idol falls to the ground, and discloses its hollowness and impotence. If we need actual experience to convince us that Ecclesiastical Synods in our days may deliberate gravely concerning the most important matters, notwithstanding the public press, ample evidence has been afforded by the American Convocation, and by the Scotch National Assembly, as well as by the recent meeting of the Prussian Synod. Though Pasquin is said to have been a

formidable power in the Romish Church, we will not vail our flag to his English representatives.

The Quarterly Reviewer indeed, and others, have admonisht us that our *strength is to sit still*, and have reminded us of the Divine warning, *In returning and in rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and confidence shall be your strength; and ye would not.* The purport of this warning however is only to prevent us from having recourse to illegitimate means for the sake of delivering ourselves from an oppressive yoke. When a burthen is upon us, which we cannot remove by the exertion of any lawful power, we are to submit to it. But the command does not apply to cases where a lawful course is open before us. When tyranny of any kind is pressing on the Church, her strength will mostly be to sit still. But there is no such tyranny now. Through God's mercy the Church is free from all outward bondage. If she is under any bondage, it is through the weakness of her own will, through her own apathy and carelessness, through her jealousies and contentions. Under this, our strength is not to sit still, but to rise up and cast it off.

NOTE K: p. 40.

Since this Charge was delivered, the institution of Rural Chapters has been revived in the Diocese of London; and the regulations for them issued by the Bishop seem to have been modeled in great measure after those framed for our Diocese by Bishop Otter; the lovers of whose memory must needs rejoice that, even when dead, he should still be the source of benefits, not only to his own immediate children, but also to other portions of our Church. From the language used by the Bishop of St David's in his Charge for 1842, we may expect that the same institution will soon be revived, if it is not so already, in his Diocese. In page 17, when speaking of the rural Deans, he says: "Another important branch of their office is, to serve as centres of union for the clergy of the Deanery.—I am convinced that great

benefit would be likely to arise from meetings of the Clergy, held periodically in each Deanery under the presidency of the Rural Dean, for the purpose of communication on all subjects connected with the general and local interests of the Church. In these conferences doubts might be removed, and information and advice interchanged, on whatever points either of doctrine or practice might occur in the course of your parochial ministrations. And with these meetings there might be advantageously connected the formation of libraries and reading societies, which might supply the want of theological works, and particularly of the more important in modern literature, which is often so painfully felt by clergymen in retired situations with limited incomes." The last suggestion I hail with much pleasure, being convinced that the formation of Theological Libraries in connexion with our Rural Chapters might be a source of wide and lasting good, on a scale continually increasing, as the libraries would every year become richer in sound theological works. In this persuasion I have ventured to offer a like recommendation at several Chapter-meetings, and in my Charge in the year 1841, p. 55; and some beginnings have been made in the way of carrying it into effect.

A similar opinion, strongly in favour of such meetings, has been exprest by the Bishop of Glocester in his Charge for 1844, p. 21. "Ever since I have held my present station among you, I have been in the habit of recommending that the Clergy of each neighbourhood should have frequent meetings for the special purpose of considering the state of their respective parishes, of giving and receiving counsel in the difficulties which are of perpetual occurrence in parochial ministrations, of collecting contributions for ecclesiastical charities, of regulating a clerical book-society, and disposing of other business conducive to the general benefit of the Clergy, and the right discharge of their functions. If such meetings take place under the presidency of the Rural Dean, a regular and constant opportunity will be afforded of communicating with the Diocesan, in order that, upon all subjects of moment which arise, they may be in possession of his sentiments. I shall not disguise that, in addition to those objects, I have always

regarded such meetings as the means of bringing together in friendly association and for purposes of mutual benefit, those whom a difference of sentiment, or at least a difference of party, had kept assunder. Much asperity of feeling would be mitigated, much jealousy would be allayed, were they whose views on some controverted points are different, more in the habit of meeting upon common ground, in the advancement of matters of common interest, in regard to which no discrepancy of sentiment exists. Other grounds of recommendation will suggest themselves to your minds in favour of such periodical meetings, which are, I believe, maintained in several parts of this Diocese. I understand that elsewhere the ancient Decanal Synods have been revived with the best consequences. These are in effect assemblages of the same character and tendency as I have just described, with the addition of such solemnity and authority, as tend to give them weight and permanence. Many of you are probably acquainted with the history of these synods from a book of much interest to our profession, *Horae Decanicae Rurales*. Whether such solemn meetings can conveniently be adopted under the present circumstances of this Diocese, I am not prepared to decide. But in this, as in other matters, I desire to consult the wishes and feelings of my Clergy; and, should it be consonant to the general sense of the incumbents in the respective Deaneries, I shall be happy to give to the scheme all the sanction of my authority, with the distinct understanding that at such meetings questions of a controversial nature are never to be agitated."

Nay, even the Archbishop of Canterbury, slow as he ever is, from feeling the importance of every word which falls from a person occupying his position, to recommend anything like an innovation, has said in his last Charge, for 1844, after touching on the revival of Rural Deaneries: "The establishment of associations, corresponding with these ecclesiastical divisions, which might bring the Clergy together at stated times, and afford opportunities of personal intercourse and consultation on matters of interest to the Church,—such as the administration of their parishes, the conduct of schools for the poor, the relief of clergymen disabled by infirmity,

and their widows and orphans,—has been recommended by high authorities in the church, and under good regulation would, I believe, be exceedingly useful. It would give me pleasure to see them established in this Diocese; and one of their earliest and most beneficial occupations would be, to procure and perpetuate a regular supply from every parish for the maintenance of Missions in the Colonies,—a tribute of charity from the Church to her exiled children, a pledge of her parental affection, and unceasing regard to their welfare in body and soul. If the only result of such brotherly union among the Clergy were to enable the Church, by the joint application of all her powers, to send forth her ambassadors on the seas wherever there is need of their aid, she would have the satisfaction of having faithfully executed one of the great commands of her Lord. But I should look for the further advantage of leading the way to the settlement of differences, which disquiet both Clergy and Laity, and deprive the country at large of much of the benefit which would be derived from cordial co-operation in the spirit of brotherly love:" pp. *34*, *35*.

In a note on this passage he adds, with the exemplary caution which characterizes him: "The attention of such meetings—would of course be restricted, by definite rules, to the subjects specified in the Charge, or subjects of a similar nature. Discussions on matters of theological controversy, or on the general polity of the Church, should be carefully excluded, and no publication of proceedings be allowed. The emanation of public resolutions or acts from such meetings would lead to the disturbance of order in the Church, and too probably multiply, instead of healing, divisions." On the expediency of these regulations my own observation and reflexion had led me to a like conclusion. Of course there is a danger lest the discussions at Rural Chapters should assume a controversial character: but, whenever I have been present at them, they have been conducted soberly and with good temper; and if activity and zeal have their possible evils, inactivity and listlessness have their certain and far more mischievous ones. To obviate the former, it seems to me very desirable, that, according to Bishop Otter's rules, a report of the

proceedings at each Chapter should be transmitted regularly to the Archdeacon, and by him, at least when there is any call for so doing, to the Bishop. Thus any tendency to assume a polemical character might be checkt at the outset. The Archdeacon would feel it his duty to pay frequent visits to a Chapter where any such tendency was discernible: and, from the respect for ecclesiastical authority which distinguishes the great body of the Clergy, his interposition would almost always be effectual. If not, the Bishop's would be so.

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH IN TIMES OF TRIAL:

A CHARGE TO THE CLERGY OF THE ARCHDEACONRY OF LEWES,

DELIVERED AT THE ORDINARY VISITATION IN 1848;

WITH NOTES,

ESPECIALLY ON THE CONTROVERSY TOUCHING THE MANAGEMENT OF SCHOOLS, AND ON THE JEWISH QUESTION,

BY JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A.

LONDON:
JOHN WILLIAM PARKER, WEST STRAND:
SOLD BY MACMILLAN, CAMBRIDGE.

1848.

LONDON:
Printed by S. & J. BENTLEY, WILSON, and FLEY,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

TO THE CLERGY

OF THE ARCHDEACONRY OF LEWES.

My dear Brethren,

According to common rule, the publication of this Charge ought to follow that of its predecessors; and unhappily I am already three-deep in your debt. But, as the subjects treated of in this are of immediate practical interest, you exprest a wish at the Visitation, that it should not be kept back till a period, which you seemed to think almost as indeterminate and distant as the Greek Calends. You said, it ought to come out now, while the controversies, on which it speaks, and which it attempts to clear up and allay, are going on. With this your wish I have felt bound to comply, adding some Notes, where it seemed desirable to enter more fully into the argument on certain points of detail, than was practicable in the Charge. In this breach of order, I am only falling in with the fashion of the year, in which, in so many unforseen, unheard-of ways, the last has become first; in which too it has been exemplified, how that inversion of earthly order, which, we are told, will often have place in

the Kingdom of Heaven, is the common practice in the Anarchy of Hell. To England, I have been led to remark in the Charge, and to the English Church, has been vouchsafed in divers respects an honorable precedence among nations. Let us bear in mind, that, while we all share in the honour and the responsibility of this precedence, ours will be the guilt and the shame and the condemnation, if she forfeits it and becomes last; and may God enable us to perform our part in upholding and preserving it! As the best means toward this end, let it be our continual aim to speak and to do the truth in love, in that love which delivers us from all false fear of man, as well as from every other temptation, and which strengthens us to speak and to act boldly, as in the presence of God. In this spirit I have desired to speak to you. You have requested to have my words in a more lasting form. To you then they are dedicated. Accept and adopt whatever may be good in them; reject whatever is evil; and may we be enabled, in all our intercourse with each other, to speak and to hear the truth more and more in the spirit of love!

Your affectionate Brother,

JULIUS CHARLES HARE.

HERSTMONCEUX,
November 17th, 1848.

CONTENTS.

		PAGE
CHARGE.	The Duty of the Church in Times of Trial	1
NOTE A.	Reply to an accusation of garbling extracts	65
NOTE B.	On the proper restrictions to the Right of the Crown in appointing Bishops	67
NOTE C. to NOTE I.	On the negociations between the Committee of Privy Council and that of the National Society, concerning the Clauses to regulate the Management of Schools	69
NOTE J.	On the Clergy Offenses Bill	83
NOTE K.	On the Proviso for making the Thirty-nine Articles the legal Test of Heresy.....	84
NOTE L.	On the Petition to Parliament in favour of this Proviso.	87
NOTE M. to NOTE U.	On the Bill for admitting the Jews into Parliament.....	89
NOTE V.	On the typical use of natural phenomena in Prophecy...	133
NOTE W.	On the beneficial effects of the French Revolution	133
NOTE X.	On the pantheistic parodies of Christianity	134
NOTE Y. and NOTE Z.	On the prospects of the Protestant Church in Germany	144

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH

IN TIMES OF TRIAL.

My Reverend Brethren,

If on some former occasions I have been almost oppressed with the consciousness of the solemn responsibility lying upon those who are called to speak of the duties and prospects of the Church in these momentous times, what must be my feelings now? What are your feelings, my Brethren, when you reflect on the events of the last eight months? what have they been? if indeed you have ever found quiet leisure for gathering your thoughts to reflect on them,—if the press and throng and crash, with which they have succeeded one another, have not so swept you along and stunned you, as well-nigh to stifle the power of reflexion. For with such rapidity have they come forward one after another, so quick and sudden and complete have been their transformations, it has almost seemed as though, while our movements through space and our modes of communication have been so marvellously accelerated by the inventions of the last twenty years, a similar acceleration had been whirling the destinies of nations, and the whole course of the world along; so that, before we can adequately combine and arrange the various features of one prospect, it has changed into another, and again into

another. Nay, has not the history of Europe during these last months been like a grand display of fireworks, in which one gorgeous or portentous form after another has glared and blazed for a moment before the eye, with alternations ever and anon of darkness, each form vanishing ere the eye itself could discern its ill-defined outlines? It is not to be wondered at, that at such a time, when the pulse of the world is beating so much more rapidly than usual, many have foreboded that its dissolution must be drawing nigh. To reflect however on the events of time, to view them in their relation to eternity, to trace, so far as we can trace, the purposes of God in them, to ponder in what way they are designed to minister to the increase of His Son's Kingdom, in what way we are to deal with them, what particular truths they are meant to teach us, what new duties they impose on us,—this is the special task of those who are appointed to exercise any part of the prophetical office in the Church. Therefore, as we are here assembled today, on this little isthmus between the past and the future, with the waves indeed dashing tumultuously on all sides, yet having gained a resting-place for a moment, from which to look back on all we have lately been going through, in order that we may try, with God's help, to ascertain what are the peculiar obligations at this moment lying upon us, what the snares and temptations most likely to lead us astray, what therefore we have chiefly to guard and strive against, I trust, my Brethren, you will bear with me, while I endeavour to speak to you with freedom and frankness, and at the same time with an earnest, affectionate desire for the welfare of every one of you, and of the

whole Church, on the weighty, pressing, awful questions, which the events of the last year bring before our thoughts.

Even the questions belonging to the peculiar sphere of our Church, which have been started by the occurrences of the last year, have been more numerous and important than in ordinary years, and have excited an unwonted agitation throughout the land, an agitation very disproportionate to their real moment, and which has betokened the inflammable state of men's minds. During the last four months however, the interest of these questions, great as it was, has been thrown into the background by the convulsions which have followed one another like the shocks of an earthquake, and have been changing the whole political and social condition of Europe. The reverberation of these shocks has already been felt, and may not improbably be felt still more, unless God vouchsafes to protect us, in England also: and though in common times it may not be advisable on this occasion to mix up political matters with those more properly pertaining to our official duties, it seems scarcely possible today to turn entirely aside from those momentous questions which are agitating every thoughtful heart throughout Europe. Even the heathen poet was able to discern that it is the province and duty of man *humani nihil a se alienum putare*, to feel an interest in everything that touches the hearts or affects the wellbeing of his fellows: and how much more deeply and vividly is this duty of sympathy with all the cares and wants and distresses of our fellow-creatures imprest on us by the obligations of Christian brotherhood! Moreover, while the events of every

succeeding day are shewing us more forcibly than ever, that no earthly power, no earthly skill can avail to heal the diseases and wounds of humanity, we know that for them also there is a remedy, if we can but bring it forth, and if men can be persuaded to receive it, in that Gospel which has the promise of this world, as well as of the world to come.

The first event of importance to the Church, which occurred after our last Visitation, was the Meeting of Convocation. These Meetings have acquired rather more significance of late years, than they possest during the previous century. In proportion as the consciousness of our ecclesiastical life has become more vivid, we have also felt the need of a council, in which that life should manifest itself, and by which the laws and rules and institutions of the Church should be adapted to the altered circumstances and exigencies of the age. That such a desire is both natural and reasonable, few will dispute. That our present position is a most anomalous one, nobody can well deny. Divers persons indeed, as is ever the case when a change is demanded, however palpable its advantage may be, or however imperative its necessity, have boded that it would cause still greater evils, than those under which we are at present suffering. Into this argument I will not enter now, having considered it at some length in a Note to my Charge on *the Means of Unity*. But having spoken to you more than once in former years on the desirableness of an Ecclesiastical Synod, I feel bound to state that this desirableness appeared to be recognised by a considerable majority of the members who were present in the Lower House of Convocation at our Meeting in last

November; and the expression of our desire, which we introduced into the Address sent down to us, was readily adopted by the Upper House. I could have wisht for my own part that the expression had been stronger; and I proposed an amendment to that effect. But another amendment, which did not differ very materially from mine, being proposed at the same time, both fell to the ground. It is not to be wondered at that a body of men, who meet once in six or seven years for three or four hours, and most of whom are strangers to each other, should not fall at once into that orderly procedure, which a little experience suggests, and which is indispensable for carrying debates to a definite conclusion. Such a number of topics too came before us during those few hours, that it was impossible for any of them to receive the consideration they required. Owing to this cause, and to the vehement agitation by which the Church has been disturbed more than once since, I am afraid, the likelihood of the speedy meeting of an Ecclesiastical Synod has not been increast by the last Convocation. The somewhat faint expression of our wishes has been overpowered by the din of our subsequent disputes.

Among the subjects that were brought before us, one has since excited a lamentable ferment, and a painful and distressing controversy, a controversy in which I was reluctantly compelled to take a prominent part. For as I was called upon to invite you, my Reverend Brethren, to pronounce an opinion more or less condemnatory of a writer who had filled the highest theological chair in one of our Universities, it became a duty, which I could not decline, to examine the grounds

alledged in behalf of that opinion: and seeing that a careful examination of those grounds convinced me that they were utterly futile, I dared not shrink from the further duty imposed upon me by my office, of warning you more especially, and such other persons as might give ear to my warning, against being misled by what seemed to me an unjust clamour. In so doing I was aware that the opinion I had to express was at variance with that entertained by some of you. But surely you will agree with me that this was no reason for my suppressing it, that on the contrary this only made it more incumbent on me to speak out plainly and without delay, in order that, if possible, I might withhold some of those, whom I knew to have formed their conclusions on very inadequate grounds, from taking a step which they would afterward deeply regret.

On the subject matter of this disastrous controversy I will not speak (A). But as the wrath of man, though of itself it does not work the righteousness of God, is often overruled to work it, so may we hope that in the present instance He, who alone can, and who often does, will educe good for His Church out of this evil. We may hope that, at a time when it is becoming more and more a recognised principle of politics, that there should be a sympathy and conformity between governments and the nations they are set to govern, a rightful deference will be paid to the feelings and opinions of the Clergy in the appointment of those who are to rule over them. Since the ancient forms, which were regarded as affording some sort of security on this head, have been proved to be empty nullities, let us further

hope, and do what in us lies, to obtain, that some real, efficient enactment may be provided,—it would not be difficult to devise one,—whereby the Church may be preserved from any encroaching tyranny on the part of the State (B).

On the other hand there is a warning and admonition with regard to our own conduct, to be drawn from the controversy referred to, which, if we give heed to it, will be of still greater value, and will far more promote the welfare of the Church. If any one thing was manifest on this occasion, it was, that a number of persons, who took no slight part in the controversy, had a very slender acquaintance with the grounds on which they were acting. I am not intending to express any censure on those, who, after a calm examination of the case, were led to a conclusion different from mine. Every conscientious conviction I desire always to respect. But surely, my Reverend Brethren, you must all concur with me, when I ask you the question thus generally, that it does not become any person, least of all a minister of Christ's Church, to take a step whereby he conveys a grave censure on a brother, without carefully investigating and sifting the reasons on which that censure is founded. Surely this at all events is involved in our Lord's words commanding us not to judge. Surely too it especially beseems our clerkly character to set an example of caution and deliberation in forming our judgements. At a time when the Church is so torn by the counter-currents of party-spirit, and when each party has its journals, which live by fanning and fostering and fueling, and almost pandering to its prejudices, it is more than ever incumbent on each of us to keep a strict

watch over our prejudices, and to be especially scrupulous in ascertaining the exact truth of whatever makes against an opponent. Party-spirit, like every other evil spirit, flies from the light, and dwells in darkness, because its deeds are dark. It is in the darkness that incendiaries prowl about, political and religious incendiaries, as well as others. Let us shun them, and their darkness, and endeavour to walk always in the light.

Had this principle been acted upon, the second controversy of which I have to speak, would have been much less vehement and briefer; that, I mean, which has been excited by the Clauses concerning the management of Schools required by the Privy Council as a condition of their grants. If this matter had been treated calmly, and with the desire of attaining to an amicable result, not only would much needless irritation and asperity have been avoided, but the points of difference, which are of any real importance, would probably have been adjusted satisfactorily long ago. For there are certain premisses, as to which, it seems to me, all intelligent and candid persons, who consider the subject, must agree.

In the first place it would appear to have been lost sight of by many, that, when a new School is establisht, it is necessary to have a deed conveying the School to certain Trustees, who thenceforward have the sole legal authority to controll and manage it, unless their authority be limited by some express provision. To persons who have no acquaintance with such matters, all legal deeds are irksome and annoying. People like to have their own way in everything, and are unwilling to fetter what they deem their liberty of action. Trust-deeds,

testaments, settlements seem to them very cumbrous and uncongenial. Why should not all things be left to go right, without passing through a process of legal drilling? Nor, until we are lessoned by experience, are we at all aware how important it is, that questions, in which the disposition of property is concerned, should be technically regulated and determined. So apt too are we to think merely of the present, and of the future solely as a prolongation of the present, that we are very slow to project our thoughts into a period when that which now is will be wholly changed. Owing to these causes, the Foundation-deeds of Schools have often been drawn up with great negligence, vesting them inconsiderately in Trustees, who have felt little or no interest in education. I have been informed by two excellent clergymen, who have faithfully and judiciously discharged the office of Inspector, and who have thus been led officially to examine the Trust-deeds of Schools, that such cases are not uncommon, and that sometimes the whole purpose of the School has been frustrated thereby. In some instances Trustees, who were averse to education, have shut up a school; in very many they have appointed inefficient, incompetent teachers, the office being conferred, for the sake of relieving the Poor-rates, on persons whose sole claim was that they could not earn their livelihood in any other way. Yet, when the Trust-deed has once been confirmed, there is no redress for such abuses, except by a special Act of Parliament, the expense of which renders it unattainable. Now the knowledge of these cases, and of the great importance of Trust-deeds, has led the Committee of the Privy Council naturally and rightfully to desire that such mischiefs,

which it is so difficult to remedy afterward, might be prevented in future by the adoption of Trust-deeds, which should provide, as far as possible, for the permanent efficiency and good management of Schools. Surely too, when their attention had once been directed to the evils which accrue from the present irregularities, it would have been a most culpable neglect of duty, if they had not tried to secure the Schools, on which public money is bestowed, from similar accidents and abuses (c).

This, I think, if we look at the matter candidly, we must needs perceive, was the original purpose of the Clauses, which have excited so much opposition. Hence it seems to me that, if we had not been under the influence of unfavorable prepossessions, we should not have taken offense, or had jealous suspicions excited, but should rather have been thankful for being thus preserved from the consequences of our inexperience. At all events I should myself have been so, if I could have obtained such help and guidance some years since for framing the Trust-deed of the School in my own Parish: and I have been informed that several persons, who have received this help, have exprest their gratitude on account of it.

It is true, though the primary intention of the framers of the Clauses was not unfriendly to the Church, yet, as they would inevitably look at the affair from a different point of view, they might introduce provisions, which we, from our point of view, might deem inexpedient, or even hurtful. Still, if such was the case, it ought to have been made the subject of an amicable negociation. That there was no hostility, open or lurking, in the Committee of the Privy Council, — could

we suppose such to have existed,—they proved in the first instance by their desire to frame their clauses in conformity to the Terms of Union required by the National Society, and afterward by submitting them to the Committee of the National Society, and adopting the chief part of the changes which the latter Committee suggested. That they should subsequently have been unwilling to alter and modify them again and again, according to the wishes or caprices of each individual applicant for a grant, is not to be wondered at, and cannot form a reasonable ground for complaint. Is not every Society, which makes grants in aid of any public works, wont to attach certain conditions to its grants, and to require that those conditions should be strictly complied with? If the conditions are objectionable, we may find fault with them on that ground; but we ought not to find fault with them on the ground of their being imperative. Public bodies are constrained to bind themselves by general laws, were it only to protect themselves from the constantly occurring temptations to partiality, and to obviate the endless discussions and disputes which would arise, unless each particular case were decided according to some general rule. Hence I can feel no sympathy with those who object to the Clauses on the score of their being compulsory. Much energetic declamation has been poured out on this head, as though the clauses were an infringement of an Englishman's vested privilege of doing as he likes, right or wrong. The wise however know, that true freedom does not lie in the region of wilfulness, but in that of a willing obedience to law: and the wisest of poets has taught us what sort of character will

protest the most vehemently against compulsion, so that he will not even give reasons upon compulsion. A certain degree of liberty should indeed be left open, that the general forms may be adapted to the varying circumstances of particular parishes: but when the main principles and outlines have been agreed upon as expedient, it seems to me that a body entrusted by Parliament with the power of voting grants of public money, is under a kind of necessity to make their rules compulsory.

I do not forget that, in the case of grants to some of the Dissenting bodies, the Committee of the Privy Council have been induced to exempt them from some of the restrictions, as well as from the supervision, to which we are liable; and certain persons have cried out that it is very unjust and shameful, that we of the Church should have a worse measure dealt to us than they have. Now I confess, it has seemed to me, on more than one occasion of late years, that our Ministers have shewn what I could not but deem very reprehensible weakness in altering or giving up regulations, which they had declared to be necessary or expedient, in compliance with clamorous importunity. This is one of the many indications, which threaten that the art of government will ere long rank among the extinct arts. But at all events let us not be deluded into fancying that such an exemption is a special privilege or benefit to those to whom it is conceded. The children of the house have to submit to a care, a guidance, a rule, which is not extended to strangers. It is not a mark of oppression, but the privilege of the Church, that we are to a certain extent responsible to the State for the due discharge of those offices with

which we are invested by the State. The State recognises the Church alone, and, as one of the consequences of this recognition, is entrusted with the nomination of our Rulers; while the Dissenters are left to choose their own ministers, and give no account in any way for the discharge of their duties. The State may indeed bestow its alms on them, as in the instance of the Regium Donum; but it does not recognise them corporately: and perhaps on this ground it may be in some manner justified in not imposing the conditions I have alluded to. Only do not let us, my Brethren, envy as a privilege, what proceeds from their being treated rather as aliens than as citizens.

The time will not allow me to discuss the specific provisions in the Clauses, which have excited the most animadversion. I will only notice a couple of points, premising that, if the Committee of the Privy Council has refused to alter its rules at the request of certain individual members of our Church, it might well deem itself warranted in this refusal by the fact that such alterations were not required by the Committee of the National Society, which it has been accustomed to negociate with as the official organ of the Church in matters pertaining to education; nay, that the Committee of the National Society had declared themselves prepared to recommend the Clauses to applicants for aid (D).

The leading principle, which the Committee of the Privy Council has tried to carry out in the Clauses we are considering, is manifestly this, that the lay members of the Church ought rightfully to have a voice in the management of our Parish-schools. Now this principle, when it is stated thus broadly, few persons at

present will openly controvert. Thus far therefore we may regard the Clauses as forming a beneficial epoch in the history of our National Education; since they contain a distinct assertion of a very important principle, which almost everybody, when called upon to admit or deny it, allows to be right, though in the common practice hitherto it has often been sadly disregarded, to the injury of every party, of the Clergy, no less than of the Laity, and of the School itself. Thoroughly indeed do I concur with you, my Reverend Brethren, in holding that the Church is the rightful, and the best educater of the English people: for this is merely another way of saying, that religion is the only sound and stable foundation for a system of National Education, in a Christian land the religion of Christ; and, where there is a National Church, one main portion of its office will necessarily be to take charge of the education of the people. But I trust that you on the other hand will go along with me in disclaiming the proposition, which some have substituted for the one just stated, that the whole management and controll of our National Education ought to be vested exclusively in the Clergy. In bygone ages, when almost all the knowledge possest by a nation was concentrated in the Clergy, this was a natural consequence: nor need we be surprised that the proposition was inverted, and that it was accounted wellnigh indispensable for a teacher of youth to be in holy orders. This state of things continued down to the Reformation, being fostered by the jealous policy of that Church, which has always laboured to keep its lay members in abject spiritual subjection. Hence some of the rules

laid down by our own Church in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with reference to this as well as divers other matters, bear the marks of emanating from a like system. These rules those in our days who belong to the tribe of the Seven Sleepers, and who fancy that the world is standing still at the point where their minds fell asleep, are desirous of reviving. Yet the results from the whole system were no other than what a sagacious man would have anticipated. On the one hand the Laity, being almost precluded from taking part in the godly works of the Church, grew to deem that their vocation was altogether secular: and, as it is scarcely possible for people to preserve a lively interest in that in which they find no room for action, many, especially of the more intelligent, among the higher classes lapst into the region of practical, if not of speculative, infidelity; the evil of which was rather increast than diminisht by its combination with a nominal outward conformity. On the other hand the Clergy themselves, from occupying this false position, became outwardly weak, and, in a grievous number of cases, inwardly hollow;—weak, from the want of that help, which they ought to have sought, but which they had rather repelled,—hollow, as we are apt to grow, when we are destitute of the interchange and reciprocation of our feelings, and when we are more tenacious of our rights, than of our duties. In these days therefore, when knowledge and the faculty of teaching are so much more widely diffused, and when God has so graciously vouchsafed to awaken a livelier spirit of faith in our land, a spirit which manifests itself with such rich fruits in so many of our lay brethren, it would be a most unwis

and unrighteous abuse of the blessings so mercifully granted to us, if we attempted to prolong a usurpation, the only excuse for which lay in the condition of the age when it arose. Rather ought we joyfully to stretch out the right hand of fellowship to our lay brethren, and to join with all who are willing to join with us, in carrying on such good works as may contribute to the building up of the nation in Christian knowledge and godliness. The task is so immense, its difficulties are so enormous, we must needs feel perpetually how utterly inadequate we are to it, and what urgent need we have of help, primarily indeed of Divine help, but also of human. In these days above all, when the powers that are against us are so greatly increast, when so many fresh hindrances and dangers are starting forth on every side, surely it is as when a ship is struggling against a storm: all hands should be called to do their utmost (D).

With regard to this principle however, as I have already said, there is little open diversity of opinion; much as may be lurking, often perhaps without the consciousness of the holders. So far as my observation has extended, nearly all persons are now agreed on the propriety and expediency of having a certain number of laymen among the managers of our Parish-schools. As to the best mode of appointing them, there are differences. Some persons wish that they should be selected by the minister of the Parish, or by the Bishop of the Diocese. But this looks too much like an underhand way of clinging to that exclusive authority, which we cannot rightfully claim, and yet are unwilling to relinquish. It is keeping the Laity under a tutelage, which they have long outgrown. Practically too the

selection by the minister would often lead to painful divisions; since injudicious ministers,—and we know, my Brethren, there will always be some such,—would be influenced in their choice by personal feelings, and would pass over those with whom they were at all at variance; while laymen, who were overlookt, might take offense; and thus the School and the Parish would suffer. On the other hand it may be pronounced impossible that any Bishop, in our present enormous Dioceses, should be capable of deciding what persons in each Parish are fittest to manage the School in it. In the plan recommended by the Privy Council, there is evidently a collateral wish to remove the difficulties often found in raising funds for the support of Parish-schools. With this view inducements are held out for persons to become subscribers on a twofold scale. Subscribers of half a guinea a year elect the managers; subscribers of a guinea a year are themselves eligible.

Of course one point is of essential importance, namely, that the persons who are to have a voice in the management of our Schools, should be members of our Church; and there has been a good deal of dispute about the best way of ascertaining this. The Committee of the Privy Council are unwilling to use the Holy Communion as a test; and when we call to mind how this test was profaned, while it was used politically, we cannot wonder that they should be reluctant to revive it; more especially as they belong to that party in the State, which perseveringly contended for, and at length effected its abolition. At the same time it is to be considered that the persons who are to exercise a controll over the education of our children, ought not to be merely nominal,

but real members of our Church, and that communicating is the only outward mark of this; that they ought to have something at least of a true Christian life and spirit, which will hardly be found in the upper classes, except among communicants; and that the test in this case ought not to be a single act, which an unprincipled man might go through to gain a secular end, but a habit carried on for years. Nor would this test be adopted with the view of excluding Dissenters from any civil privileges, which ought to be open to the whole nation, but solely as a security for the religious character of institutions, which, though we may be ready to receive the children of such Dissenters as choose to place them under our tuition, are expressly establisht for the training of the children of the Church.

Still, since the Committee of the Privy Council have declared, that "it is their wish and intention, that the managers of Church of England Schools should be *bona fide* members of that Church," and that "they would be prepared to adopt any other description of the qualifications of School-managers, which would ensure this result, and which was not open to graver objections than those which it removed," we ought not to doubt that the differences on this point, as well as on other minor ones, may be settled by an amicable negociation, carried on by the Committee of the National Society under its excellent, pious President (F). Only let us, my Reverend Brethren, refrain from hindering or disturbing this negociation by needless heat and clamour. Let us keep continually in mind what our object is, of what paramount importance,—yes, of paramount importance, even when we look at it merely with reference to the

temporal and political welfare of the people and state of England,—but which, when we take a still higher view, stretches through eternity, and reaches from the bottomless abyss to the foot of the throne of God. Such is the object set before us, the moral and spiritual education of the rising generation in England. Shall we peril its attainment, because we are not allowed, each one of us, to follow our own by-path in marching toward it? Is this the way in which it behoves the Church Militant to fulfill, or rather to abandon her glorious task?

That we cannot compass our object by mere private exertions, without the concurrence and help of the State, has been sufficiently proved by the experience of these last years. Private exertions were made a few years since to an extent beyond the measure of our age: but the results of those exertions fell very far short of the wants of the nation, hightened as those wants have been by generations of neglect, and by the rapidity with which our population has been increasing, and accumulating in enormous, dense masses, under the influence of all manner of stimulants. Those exertions too were merely temporary; while the wants continue, nay, grow every year. Or can we expect to call forth similar exertions again,—can we hope that our lay brethren will be very eager to pour their gifts into our treasury,—when the chief ground of our rejecting the aid of the State would in point of fact be the reluctance of certain persons to surrender the exclusive management of their Schools by admitting our lay brethren to their rightful share in it (G)?

Another motive has indeed been spoken of in some quarters, as having contributed in no small degree to

excite the general dissatisfaction,—the jealousy felt with regard to a particular person holding an important office under the Committee of the Privy Council. But surely this is a most unworthy motive to sway the decisions of the Church on a matter so deeply affecting the political, moral, and spiritual welfare of the English nation. What! are we to break off negociations, which at length for the first time promise to supply a scheme of National Education in some sort commensurate to the wants of the people, because forsooth certain persons look with distrust on a Secretary of Council? Does not the very question make one blush, half with shame, half with indignation? If we have any positive, tangible complaints to bring forward against the person referred to, let us petition for his removal. If not, our business and our duty is to regard him as the minister ordained by God for this important office, and to treat with him as such. Jealous suspicions, that crawl about in men's hearts, but shrink from coming forward in open act, are evil counsellors, and are nowhere more out of place than in the deliberations of the Church.

Nor let us give ear to those who cry, as people are ever wont, when they have nothing more definite to urge, that the Committee of Council are designing by this measure to drive in the narrow end of the wedge, as a prelude to usurping the whole controll and management of our National Education (H). They who are fond of using this form of argument, are apt to get clencht and wedged in themselves, through their own restless ingenuity; and their end is a sort of parody of Milo's. So far as a measure is objectionable in itself, let us object to it, but not on the ground that it may pave the way for one

can't tell what terrible consequences. There is quite enough in the realities of life to occupy all our fears, if we choose to indulge in fears. But even by these realities we should not be dismayed or daunted. Let us look them in the face, knowing who is on our side. Let us try, with God's help, to contend against them, with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our mind, and with all our strength, not only individually, but collectively, with the whole heart and soul and mind and strength of the Church. If we do so, through God's help we shall overcome them. But if we turn away from the serious conflicts of duty, to gratify our wayward jealousies by shadowfights against imaginary bugbears, the enemy will gain ground on us, and the victory will be his.

Even in ordinary times, the honour which we are commanded to pay to all who are in authority, should prevent those who are under a special obligation to rule their lives according to the precepts of the Gospel, from looking habitually askance at the measures of our Government. If those party-feelings, to which the nature and history of our Constitution have given such power over the English mind, render this very difficult, we are no more emancipated from this duty thereby, than we should be from any other: we are only called to be more watchful against the perpetual, strong temptations to transgress it. When the State offers to help the Church in doing what is to promote the welfare of the nation, we should accept the offer trustfully and thankfully; unless indeed it plainly involves the sacrifice of some high principle: and this we should not suspect without an urgent necessity. Now that the Committee of the Privy Council

are really desirous of improving the education of the people, we have ample grounds for believing. This is one of the great questions of national policy, which their party have long advocated with an earnest assertion of its primary importance: nor would it be easy to devise any measures of more beneficial promise, than the recent regulations concerning Pupil-teachers and Certificates to Schoolmasters. The latter is well fitted to act as a stimulus on the existing body of schoolmasters, and to render them diligent in self-improvement, thus counteracting the natural tendency of their profession to count that they have already attained, and to forget that none can teach efficiently, except those who are continually learning. The former regulation, if it be carried out judiciously, will provide a constant supply of teachers duly trained and qualified for their task. The most intelligent and best-conducted among the children of the poor will be raised from the necessity of manual labour to serve God in the education of His people. The difficulties which at present stand in the way of our retaining them at school, after they have entered on their teens, and of our maintaining them at Training Schools, will be removed. Thus the chief cause which has hitherto baffled our efforts to educate the people, the inefficiency of the great body of our schoolmasters, will no longer exist. When such prospects are opened before us, surely we should not allow any miserable personal jealousies to prevent our cooperating cordially with the State in this godly undertaking (1). Confidence in those with whom we are to act, will win their esteem and respect, much sooner than suspicion will. Confidence wins strength. We shall be stronger in ourselves, from giving ourselves

up in singleness of heart to our work; and they in whom we trust will take pleasure in helping us.

It must be known to you all, that the vehemence of this unhappy controversy had not subsided a month ago. I would fain hope however that the singularly able and persuasive speech of the Bishop of Oxford at the Meeting of the National Society will effect much in allaying this agitation permanently, as it seems to have done with almost magical power at the time when it was delivered. On another controversy, of more recent origin, which threatened a few weeks since to excite a ferment through our whole Church, I must add a few remarks,—that, I mean, which was caused by the statement that a new definition of Heresy was to be introduced into the Bill concerning Clerical Offenses.

This Bill, I believe, has been laid before you all at the Rural Chapters, in order that every one might have an opportunity of pointing out whatever he might disapprove of therein. It was minutely discust at a Meeting of the Rural Deans of this Archdeaconry, which our kind and excellent Bishop convoked last autumn at Chichester, for the consideration of such ecclesiastical questions as any of us might deem of immediate interest. It has been repeatedly weighed, year after year, by the whole Episcopal Bench, who have had the help of all the Lawlords. Thus the utmost care has been taken to frame it so that it shall supply the means of correcting criminous Clerks, without infringing on the rights and liberties of the Clergy; and, as this twofold purpose has been kept steadily in view, we may reasonably hope that every objectionable provision will have been removed, and that our Bishops will at length be enabled to put an end to

those most grievous and terrible scandals, which arise wherever a clergyman disgraces his profession by an immoral life. The instances of such clergymen are indeed become very much rarer of late years. It is a source of perpetual thanksgiving to me to know how many zealous, godly ministers are devoting themselves every year to the service of our Lord in this Archdeaconry, which we have no reason to suppose peculiarly favoured above other parts of our Church. Still however some men, though but a few, of evil lives are to be found here and there; nor is it easy to conceive by what precautions they can ever be entirely excluded. If among the twelve Apostles there was a Judas, how can we expect that in a body of above fifteen thousand Clergy no reprobate members should be found. Therefore, as the mischief done by such men, even though there should be but one or two in a Diocese, is incalculable,—as they must almost infallibly check the growth of godliness, if not absolutely deaden it, in their own parishes, or at all events drive many of the serious-minded into dissent,—and as the offense of their conduct is sure to spread far and wide, and to be magnified by all who wish ill to the Church,—we ought to rejoice in the prospect that these fearful evils are likely to be abated. Earnestly as we may wish to preserve our order from being exposed to vexatious and groundless accusations, we should be still more desirous that the Church should be delivered from such foul, destructive plaguespots. After a repeated careful examination of the Bill, carried on in consort with several of my brother Clergy, its provisions appear to me on the whole to afford us every security we can justly require; wherefore I trust that another year will not elapse without

its becoming law, with such improvements as the reflexions of the ensuing twelvemonth may suggest (J).

Among the provisions of this Bill, is one which restores the cognisance of charges of Heresy to our ancient Ecclesiastical Courts. This is very desirable; as the reference of such questions to a Diocesan Tribunal, under the presidency of the Bishop, would expose the Church to have all manner of determinations of Heresy, according to the theological predilections and antipathies of each particular Bishop. Moreover a new Court of Appeal is constituted for all such causes, a Court incomparably better fitted to decide on them, than that to which they have hitherto been referred. Now a report has been circulated, that it was the intention of some person, whose name was not mentioned, to move the insertion of a clause in this part of the Bill, laying down that the Thirty-nine Articles are henceforward to be regarded as the sole criterion of Heresy, or false or unsound doctrine: and, in the irritable state of men's minds, this report, caught up, as it was, and made the most of by those whose favorite atmosphere is the breath of strife in the Church, excited a good deal of commotion. This commotion however, it seems to me, was altogether premature. I cannot see how it consists with that calmness and deliberation, which should characterize the proceedings of the Church, to hold meetings and draw up addresses and protests on the strength of such an indefinite report. Surely we ought rather to have waited, until we had ascertained the real nature of the proposition, which many were so forward to condemn (K).

On one ground indeed I should hold that every proposition of the kind is exceedingly objectionable. For

it would imply that the Parliament is assuming the authority of determining what is the real doctrine of our Church,—an assumption which we must never submit to, which would have been an intolerable usurpation even when the Parliament consisted exclusively of members of our Church, but which now could hardly have any other result than the disruption of the Church from the State. Such a measure, it seems to me, would be utterly lawless, except our Ecclesiastical Synod were convened to sanction and adopt it. In principle it would be lawless; and practically what scandals must ensue, if the holy doctrines of our faith were to become a subject of contentious discussion in an assembly constituted like the present House of Commons, which, we may without disparagement assert, is little qualified for such discussions by knowledge either theological or ecclesiastical, and which contains a number of members openly or secretly adverse to the tenets of our Church! For such a body to legislate concerning our doctrine would be a violation of all right and of all decorum (L). Yet we are hardly warranted in taking for granted that any such purpose exists, at least as a reason for open remonstrance, until the proposition is actually brought forward, and set in a definite shape before us.

Far less can we pronounce whether the supposed proposition is, or is not, at variance with the received law of the Church concerning doctrinal errours, until we know precisely what it professes to lay down. On the very face of the Articles, it is manifest, from their dogmatical form, and even from their title, that they were designed to be the specific enunciation of the theological tenets of our Church; and consequently they

are regarded, in the practice of our Ecclesiastical Courts, as the ordinary test whereby to determine what is heresy, or false, or unsound doctrine. This is implied, I say, in the title, in which they are stated to have been agreed upon "for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion." At the same time, since we are compelled by the Act of Uniformity to declare our unfeigned assent and consent to everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer, the doctrinal views of the Prayerbook are equally binding on our consciences. If it be askt, what is to be done, when these two tests are opposed to each other, when the doctrine of the Prayerbook differs from that of the Articles,—whether in such a case the Prayerbook should give way to the Articles, or the Articles to the Prayerbook,—the simple answer is, that we ought not to assume that any such difference exists. When there is the appearance of such a difference, it arises from our misapprehending and straining the language of that test, to which we especially lean. Finding expressions in considerable accordance with our own views, we are apt to put our own views into those expressions, overlooking the limitations by which the judicious authors of our Articles guarded against the sin of setting up the conclusions of their own understanding in the place of God's revealed truth. Thus we make that absolute and exclusive, which was only intended to be stated in coordination with other truths; and the opposition we talk about is of our own creating. If we take pains in examining both the documents carefully and candidly, with a regard to their historical as well as their literal meaning, we shall find that the differences are merely apparent,

like the contradictions which opposite theological schools will wrest out of the Bible itself. Hence, with respect to the proposed clause, it seems to me that our plain path of duty is to suspend our judgement, until it is actually brought forward, and we know its real purport, and whether it contains anything directly repugnant to the principles and practice of our Church. It is scarcely becoming in a body of Clergy to sound the alarm through the land, for the sake of waging war against an embryo proposition, as to the nature of which we have no means of forming a precise notion.

I recur to this point again and again, because, although one might have deemed that the ministers of Christ's Church would be more deeply imprest than other men with the solemn duty of not pronouncing a sentence, above all a sentence of condemnation, except after a scrupulous investigation, and under a cogent conviction of its correctness, it has appeared to me that this duty has been lamentably disregarded by many, on occasion of the three controversies I have been speaking of, during the last year. Had it not been for this cause, those controversies would have been comparatively brief. Owing to this, they have so grievously distracted the Church. Party-spirit is always negligent of justice: it judges, not according to facts, but to its own prepossessions and prejudices: and of party-spirit there is always a restless store in England. It is the natural result of our free Constitution, of the manner in which each individual Englishman feels called upon to take a personal interest in the affairs of the nation. Along with the various good effects springing from this cause, we have this evil one. Hence we are under a special obligation to

keep a vigilant guard against the excesses into which this spirit is so apt to run: and as the questions which are agitating the Church as well as the State in these days, come home to every heart, our danger in these days is peculiarly great. Let us bear steadily in mind that the maxim of the Prince of this world, the maxim of the Prince of darkness, and of all the chiefs among his crew, has ever been, *Divide et impera: Divide your opponents; and weaken them by their divisions; and they will fall an easy prey to you.* On the other hand the watchword of the Prince of Peace is *Unite: Unite your hearts to the Lord; unite them to each other; go forth in the might which that union will give you; and thereby overpower and win your enemies.* If we were indeed to enter on our blessed work with one heart and one soul and one mind, we should doubtless be enabled in God's strength to fulfill it. If we waste half our time, and more than half our force and zeal, in contending against one another, we shall have little left for fighting the battles of the Kingdom of God.

Turning away from these unhappy controversies, on the evils of which I have deemed it my duty to speak to you thus frankly and fully, I would fain express my thankfulness, — in which most of you, my Reverend Brethren, if not all, I feel sure, cordially participate, —that the Bill which was brought into Parliament for the Admission of Jews into the Legislature, was rejected by the House of Lords. On this question I grieve to find myself differing from several persons, for whose judgement I entertain the highest respect, and whose concurrence on ordinary occasions I prize as the most satisfactory confirmation of my opinions. This

however only makes me feel a stronger obligation to explain why, after carefully examining the arguments by which that Bill has been defended, I cannot find anything in them of sufficient force to necessitate or warrant our departing from the great ancient principle of our Constitution. That principle in all ages, from the very birth of our Constitution, has been, that we are a Christian People, a Christian Nation, a Christian State, and therefore that our Legislature and Government are, and ought to be, Christian.

It may be contended that this principle in early times was not expressly enunciated in any particular law. Indeed it has been argued that there is nothing to exclude the Jews from the House of Commons, except a form of words which was adopted for a totally different purpose, and which therefore only accidentally forms a bar to their admission. Surely however this is a mere sophism. It happens continually that those very principles, which are the most powerful, the most pervading, which permeate all our feelings and opinions, and are wound up with our whole being, do not receive a distinct enunciation; because, so long as we do not meet with anything to contradict or oppose them, we quietly take them for granted, and have no motive for uttering them in definite propositions. In the very act of enunciating a truth, we transform it from a living power within us into an outward object of thought. We do not make laws against that, which we do not even conceive as a possibility. No distinct Act was required to exclude Jews from Parliament, when, until very lately, they could not even hold land (M).

Before the Reformation, Christianity was practically

identified with the faith of that which assumed the exclusive name of the Catholic Church. Even heretics were then deprived of their civil rights by excommunication: those who profest a religion different from the Christian, were clast under the head of unbelievers, and could not lawfully acquire any. After the Reformation, Western Christendom became divided into a number of distinct, and often opposite bodies; and, amid the confusion caused hereby, it is not to be wondered at that the idea, which was implied in our whole Constitution, as it was in the Constitutions of the other Christian nations in Europe, workt itself out only by degrees, passing through narrow, partial forms. It was assumed, and rightly so, that the Church ought to be coextensive with the Nation. This is especially the ruling idea in Queen Elizabeth's ecclesiastical policy; and it found expression in the principle which declares that the Soverein is the head of the Church. But, owing to divers grievous errours and sins, to all manner of confusions between the secular and the spiritual, and between essentials and non-essentials, — confusions, which, when arbitrary power attempted to enforce its own narrow views, became calamitous evils,—the Nation in point of fact was very far from coinciding with the National Church. Hence, as political privileges were restricted to the National Church, there was a large part of the Nation, who were excluded from its highest civil rights, who were in a manner disfranchist, or only allowed to enjoy a lower franchise. As the confusions which had produced thisi rregular state of things, continued to prevail, and as the lessons of experience, which would have dictated a more comprehensive policy, were wholly

disregarded, the disproportion between the Nation and the Church became progressively greater and greater. Such a state of things contains the germs of its dissolution. It must be reformed; or it will be destroyed. We cannot uphold an idea or a principle, under a form to which the realities of life give the lie. The Nation was indeed Christian; but only a portion of it was comprehended in the National Church; the largest portion, it is true; but still a very large portion, and not merely numerically, —a large portion of the national wealth, of the national property, of the national industry, of the national intelligence, of the national power, both physical and moral,— lay without the pale of the National Church, to the members of which the highest civil privileges were confined. This could not last. It could not, because it ought not, because the laws, as handed down from former generations, were at variance with the true idea of the Constitution. Hence it became necessary by degrees to enlarge the pale of our institutions, so that they should comprehend the other Christian bodies in the British Empire, as well as the members of the National Church. This was effected chiefly by the Repeal of the Test Act, and by what is called the Emancipation of the Roman Catholics. I am not entering into an argument as to the expediency or propriety of these measures. I am merely speaking of them historically, as facts which have occurred, and which it was quite impossible to avert. For many years a large portion of our Church struggled against them successfully: but at length it became manifest that the struggle could no longer be maintained. Thus that which I have termed the principle of our Constitution, the principle or idea which

had been working itself out during five centuries, received its full development. All our civil privileges were thrown open to every denomination of Christians, to every person professing the faith of a Christian.

That this was not a mere accident arising from casual majorities in our Parliament, but a conclusion toward which the mind of man, impelled by the divinely appointed course of events, had gradually advanced, is proved on the one hand by the fact, that the necessity of the change forced itself by degrees on the conviction of almost all our leading statesmen, even of many who at one time were strongly opposed to it, and that now hardly any one would deem it practicable, or would even wish, that we should retrace our steps. On the other hand similar evidence is supplied by the modifications of previous institutions, which took place in a like spirit about the same time in several states on the Continent of Europe. It began to be generally acknowledged that all bodies of Christians ought to be admissible to the enjoyment of every civil privilege (N).

I have made this statement, because it seems to me of much importance to point out that there is a very broad and essential difference between the recent Bill for the Admission of Jews into the Legislature, and the previous Acts whereby the Dissenters and the Romanists were admitted. The advocates of the recent Bill have argued that it is merely the continuation and consummation of a series of measures, which the Legislature has been compelled to adopt, and by which one barrier of exclusion after another has been thrown down. On the contrary I would contend that the recent Bill is the commencement of a totally different course, the

expression of a totally different, nay, of a directly opposite principle. For hitherto the Christian character of the State and Nation has been asserted and upheld,—its Christian character, not as restricted to any one particular form of Christianity, but as embracing them all. In fact, I know not whether this is not brought out still more forcibly by the present declaration, which makes this the sole condition, without any ulterior determination, and consequently without a suspicion of favouring the interests of any one particular religious body. Whereas, by adopting the recent Bill, we should be rushing down the negative side of the hill, and plunging into that most antipolitical assertion, that all the civil privileges of a state are to be bestowed on all men, without any regard to their religion, that our Legislature henceforward is no longer to be an essentially Christian Legislature, but may be made up, to any amount, of Jews, Turks, Heretics, and Infidels (o).

The real principle of our Constitution, it seems to me, the principle which has been working itself out during the last three centuries, is that exprest by my honoured friend, Dr Arnold, in passages which have been often referred to during the discussions on this Bill, and which several of its advocates have tried to refute, though with little success, and with an inadequate appreciation of the important historical truth asserted in them (p). I do not mean that this principle has always been distinctly apprehended, even by those who have taken a leading part in working it out. As the agents in the historical development of mankind are rarely more than half conscious, mostly quite unconscious, of the work they are engaged in,—as they often suppose

themselves to have different objects in view, while God's overruling Providence shapes their ends not seldom directly against their wills,—so doubtless many of the persons who have been contending for the throwing open of all our civil privileges to all denominations of Christians, have acted under the notion that religion is an accident separable from man and from society, and that it has nothing to do with government. But even in the debates on the recent Bill,—although the principle of it appears to me to involve this proposition,—most of its chief advocates disclaimed such a consequence, and tried to rest their policy on a sounder basis.

It will doubtless be said,—indeed it has been said by more than one person with regard to Dr Arnold's opinion on the subject,—that this view of the essentially Christian character of our Legislature is a theory; and this, through some strange logical *quid pro quo*, is deemed a sufficient answer to it (Q). Let us accept the word, and acknowledge that it is a theory. What then? Is it a refutation of the Copernican and Newtonian system of the universe, to say that it is a theory? Every intelligent combination of a multitude of facts into an orderly, connected, systematic whole is a theory, *θεωρία*. Hence, when we try to arrange the facts presented by the history of our Constitution during a series of centuries, and to trace out the principles which have been unfolding themselves in that history, of course the result must be a theory. If we are able to trace the working out of the same principles contemporaneously in the other nations of Europe, it will still be a theory, *θεωρία*, only embracing a wider field of view. Should it be possible to discern the operation

of the same or similar principles in the institutions of heathen nations, the theory would become wider still. Thus, so far from there being any opposition or repugnance between theory and facts, it is impossible to make any use of facts as the materials for reasoning, unless their life and meaning is elicited from them by some sort of theory. Without a theory they are dead lumber, insulated, purposeless atoms: though of course a theory may be more or less hasty and erroneous, or partial, straining and distorting facts, or overlooking them and pushing them aside, if they seem to make against it.

But what, let us ask, is the argument on the strength of which this theory is to be condemned? on the strength of which it is contended that the Christian character of our Legislature, after having been preserved from its first origin down to this day, ought to be abandoned and sacrificed, for the sake of admitting Jews into it. This assuredly is not a theory: for there is not a single fact in our history, scarcely one, I believe I may say, in the whole history of the world, from which any such theory can be drawn, or which it would render intelligible. The whole history of the world, the history, the principles of every other Constitution, as well as of our own, bear witness to the opposite theory, and not to this. They bear witness that the government of a nation has always been, and ought always to be, connected in some manner with its religious worship, and that in the best ages of nations this connexion will be closer and more intimate; that a man's religious profession has always had, and ought always to have, an influence in determining his political privileges. There are a

number of pages in history recording the evils which have accrued from the perversion of this principle; but these only bespeak the tenacity with which man in all ages has clung to it, and in no way justify our rejecting the principle, any more than the corruptions of any other would. On the other hand the notion, on which the claim of the Jews is mainly grounded by their advocates, —that every man born in a country is to be eligible to all its civil offices, without reference to any qualification whatever, unless it be property,—is a mere fiction of abstract political speculation, a fiction contradicted by the wisdom of every nation, and by the experience of every age. In fact it is the mere spawn of that abstract pseudo-philosophy, which spread so widely over the shallow waters of the last century, and which reacht its consummation in Jacobinism, murmuring and roaring about men's rights, but knowing nothing, caring nothing about their duties; wherefore the so-called rights exploded at last into the right of committing every crime under the sun. The wiser doctrine of our Constitution, the doctrine of all sound political philosophy, is, that political rights are the creatures of laws, of those customs which are unwritten laws, and of organized social institutions, and that no man can have any political rights, except what he derives from these laws and institutions; while on the other hand it is the duty of the framers and modifiers of these laws and institutions in each country to be guided, in the distribution and apportionment of political rights, by a full, comprehensive, impartial, large-minded consideration of that which will promote the welfare, moral, social, and economical, of the whole State and of all its members (R). Hence

we may discard all arguments drawn from any supposed right of the Jews to political privileges. Right, as such, they have none; seeing that the laws and customs and institutions of England have never given them such a right, nay, have been altogether opposed to it. The true question is rather: is there any political necessity, or any political benefit of sufficient strength, to justify us in giving up the ancient Christian principle of our Constitution?

Of course I am not intending to lay down that every State, or that the Government and Legislature of every State, ought to be exclusively Christian. Ideally doubtless they ought to be so, even as every man ought, if he fulfilled God's purpose, and the true idea of his own nature. The Christian State is the highest form of a State, and alone fulfills the idea of a State. It alone contains those living, mighty principles of action, which will enable and impell the governors and the governed to discharge all their reciprocal duties (s). But the realities of the world, we know too well, diverge and deviate very far from the idea of what they ought to be: and the first duty of a Government is to attend to the realities of the world, to the real, actual condition of the people under it. The duty of raising the people out of their present condition into one more in conformity with the idea of what they ought to be, can only come second. Hence, if it had so happened, that the Jews formed a large portion, say a third, or a fourth, of the people of England, and if their social and moral weight were in any proportion to their numbers, it would then become the duty of the Legislature to consider what share this great and powerful part of the community

ought to have in the national representation. If they even formed a tenth or a twentieth, some question of the kind would require impartial discussion. For in such a case the basis, on which we found our assertion that the Legislature ought to be Christian, because we are a Christian people, would no longer be tenable. We should have ceast to be a Christian people; and a Christian Legislature, as the representative of the people, would therefore be a false pretense. When a Christian people are ruling as conquerors over a vast heathen population, as for instance in India, the solution of the problem will have to be modified by a variety of considerations; even if this were a case to which the system of a Representative Legislature could be applied. How far the diffusion of infidelity in France and Germany may have warranted the framers of their new Constitutions in laying down that political rights and privileges are not to be affected by any regard to a person's religious profession, I cannot presume to pronounce. At all events this does not belong to a normal, but to a most miserably abnormal and diseased condition of society, in which it would almost seem to be crumbling back into its elements (T). Now we, through God's mercy, have hitherto been preserved from falling so low. Through God's mercy we may still say, that we are a Christian people, and that therefore we ought to have a Christian Legislature. Seeing that the Jews scarcely amount to more than a thousandth part of our population, we are under no political or moral obligation to violate the Christian principle of our Constitution by admitting Jews into it.

I have endeavoured briefly to point out the great

political principle by which, it seems to me, our Legislature were warranted, or rather bound, to reject the Bill for the Admission of Jews. That Bill was directly opposed to one of the fundamental principles of our Constitution, and could not have been carried without the subversion of that principle. It was not forced upon us by any political necessity. It was not enjoined by any political or moral expediency. No good whatever would have resulted from it; and the evil would have been incalculable, inasmuch as it would have been the first step toward the unchristianizing of our Legislature. A friend of mine, who was in Paris at the end of last year, heard one of the speakers in the Chamber of Peers say, *Nous, qui ne sommes ni Catholiques, ni Chrétiens:* and, when some persons dissented, he appealed to the Laws as his authority. When such language could be uttered under the sanction of the Laws, it is not to be wondered at that the whole Government should have been shoveled away two months after like a heap of rubbish. God grant that we may never hear such words within the walls of our Parliament! may the time never come when any one will be entitled to say *We are not Christians here!* Yet anyone may, if our Christian profession on entering Parliament be abolisht, so that Christianity will no longer be esssential, but a mere accident to our Legislature (u).

The time will not allow me to enter into an examination of the arguments by which the recent Bill was defended. That on which, it was alledged, the claims of the Jews mainly rested, belongs, it seems to me, as I have already said, to that spurious political philosophy, which has wrought such vast mischief during the last sixty years, which deals with rights as abstractions, caring

little about history, or the existing state of things, and spins a notional polity out of its own brain. Whereas the true political philosopher will deduce the idea of a constitution out of its history, not from the bare facts, but from the principles which have manifested themselves in those facts, and which have been working their way through them to a fuller, completer development. So too the true statesman, as we see him impersonated in Burke—who is also the grandest impersonation of the true political philosopher,—will look at every great national and constitutional question historically, not merely with reference to the outward shell and crust of history, but to the ideas and principles which have been unfolding and expanding in it. He will indeed earnestly desire to correct the abuses, which Time, and the foolishness and sinfulness of man, are continually introducing into every human work. He will desire no less earnestly so to modify the institutions of former ages as to adapt them to the altered condition and circumstances of the people. But he will always bear in mind, that, however it might flatter his vanity to sweep away the existing order of things, and to set up a totally new system in its place, yet that, with regard to institutions, as in the Eastern tale, the new lamp, though it look neat and bright, is powerless, the old lamp, with all its rust, has a spirit that belongs to it, of mighty, mysterious, magical power; and therefore he will beware of the temptations to exchange the old lamp for the new.

These thoughts lead us naturally to the events which have just been transforming the whole aspect of Europe: and how can I close this address without saying a few words to you on matters, which for the last four months

have been almost absorbing our attention and interest, and which are unparalleled in the history of the world? Formerly, when we have met on this occasion, it has been under the belief that the coming years would in the main be like the past,—that some of us, here and there one, would be taken away, so that their names would no longer be called upon earth, and that other names would be sounded in their stead,—but that our work would on the whole continue the same as it always had been, our duties the same, our motives and incentives the same, our diligence and zeal, we would fain hope, greater, yet still of the same kind; and we should almost as soon have expected that the laws of Nature would be stript of their force, that the sea and the land would change places, and that the stars would drop from their spheres, as that the political order of human affairs through the chief part of Europe would be utterly confounded, that the primary laws and fundamental relations of society would be subverted, that throne after throne would be trampled under the feet of the rabble, and that the refuse of the people would start up as their rulers. Yet these things, we know, have been going on, not in some one country,—as has been the case aforetime in ages of revolution,—but in one country after another. No pestilence ever spread so rapidly as the contagion of popular fury. The work of years was condenst into a day, almost into an hour. That which was held to be the strongest, proved to be utterly weak. That which had always been esteemed as wisdom, came out as arrant foolishness. It was as though a mask had suddenly been wrencht off from the face of Europe, and as though everything was discerned to be the very opposite of that

which it had been deemed; even as it will be at the great final unmasking of all the deceits and frauds of the world. The very means of strength, on which mankind had always relied,—and which they had tried to gather and pile around them, counting that, if they could do so, they were quite safe,—crumbled away in the hand which attempted to grasp them. Armies were paralysed. Statecraft was caught in the meshes of its own devices. Governments, which had stood for more than half a millennium, the roots of which spread through remote ages, and might have been supposed to strike into the heart of the earth, were removed like a tent, and cast down like a house of cards. Law, discipline, order, custom, reverence had lost their power. Nothing triumpht, except brute force, chance, wilfulness. Chaos seemed to be coming again, to swallow up all the fruits of a thousand-yeared civilization.

Our own country has indeed been happily exempt from the fiercer shocks of these convulsions. But who can tell how long it will continue so? That there are huge masses of the elements of evil, of the most virulent and destructive kind, fermenting in divers parts of England, has been proved by occasional outbreaks, and still more by the elaborate enquiries of Committees appointed by Parliament for the purpose. Can we hope that the hurricane, which has been sweeping away other Governments, will leave ours unscathed? that, while the fabric of society is tottering and falling to pieces in other countries, it will stand unshaken here? At all events we are bound by numberless ties of affection, of esteem, of common interests and aims, with the other nations of Europe. They cannot suffer, without our suffering also:

and, as we can hardly expect to continue erect, when all around are prostrate or falling, so we cannot contemplate the bare prospect of such an isolation without dismay.

What will be the fate of England? Will she weather the storm, which is strewing the earth with wrecks? We can hardly help asking ourselves this question; and our hearts will often quail as we ask it. But there is another question also, of still deeper interest to the heart of man, and which involves whatever of hope or fear connects itself with the future destinies of mankind: what will be the fate of Christ's Church throughout the earth? what will be the fate of Christianity? that is, so far as man's eye can see, so far as his understanding can draw conjectures from the signs of the times.

In one respect indeed there has been a noticeable difference between the bearing and conduct of the revolutionary spirit toward religion at the close of the last century and now. In the former Revolution its bearing was that of hatred, scorn, defiance, insult, outrage. But this year it has seemed that the revolutionary spirit has wisht to shew respect to religion, that, according to its own phraseology, it has been desirous of fraternizing with Christianity, that it has been willing, as is said of one of the Roman Emperors, to receive Christ among the gods of its Pantheon, or rather among the heroes in the temple of its self-worship. This change is in great measure the result of the philosophical and historical enquiries and speculations of recent times; owing to which the shallow, ignorant, sneering Atheism, so much admired under the name of Philosophy in the last century, can no longer lift up its voice. Yet the Pantheism, which has followed it, is scarcely better

essentially. Indeed in some respects it is almost worse, or at least more mischievous, as being more subtile, more guileful, more delusive, from having an imposing show of grandeur and comprehensiveness, which however, when tried, proves to be hollow. The lion's voice at first sounded so soft and gentle, one might have fancied that, to use the expression of our great poet, he was trying to roar "like a sucking dove;" and he gave out that his claws had been pared, that he was become a well-bred Christian beast, and had lost his relish for blood and crackling bones. But we have already seen dismal proofs that the human lion does not thus easily change his nature, which after a while breaks forth as rabid and ravenous as ever. So too the events of late years in Switzerland have shewn, that the toleration, of which Irreligion makes such boast, will soon change into persecution. Nay, what is it that Religion wants? not compliments and courtesies: not that people should talk in elegant and civil, or laudatory phrase about her: not that they should bear with her, and tolerate her. She wants men's hearts and wills, their faith, their love, their obedience. She wants men's hearts and wills, that she may restore them to their owners in a new and sanctified state. If these are withheld, everything else is worthless.

What then, I again ask, may we conjecture, so far as our human sagacity can read the signs of the times, will be the fate of the Church of Christ in the years which are coming upon us? I cannot, for my own part, draw any favorable anticipations from the manner in which the spirit of the Revolution has been attempting to fraternize with Christianity. On the contrary, as the chief evil which Christianity has to dread, is not

open and forcible aggression from without, but that insidious insinuation, which cripples men's zeal, and poisons their faith, so, among the saddest signs of the times, has been the reciprocation which the fraternizing of the revolutionary spirit has won,—the examples of the ministers of Christ who have been beguiled into fraternizing with the spirit of the Revolution. That which has been proved by all experience hitherto, is equally true now. The blood of martyrs is still the seed of the Church. She cannot increase without it. She cannot increase, except where there is the readiness to shed it in her behalf. As it was by the great selfsacrifice of her Divine Author that her foundations were originally laid, so it is through selfsacrifice that she has continually increast, by innumerable acts of selfsacrifice, the only acts which find a place within her, the only stones whereof she is built. Hence, if there is any recent event from which we might deduce anything like hopeful prospects for Religion, in these times when political institutions are crumbling and falling to the ground, it is the selfsacrifice of that martyred Prelate, who trod with solemn joy in the steps of his Heavenly Master, and went forth with fixt, steady purpose to follow the example of the Good Shepherd, who gave His life for His sheep.

If we look however at the present state of Europe in the light of God's word, its aspect becomes less dismal. Indeed such is ever the nature of God's word, that, though it may often be dim and cloudy, when the sun of this world is shining upon us, yet, when night and darkness gather around those who seek for its guidance, it brightens into a pillar of fire. The events of the

last six months may well remind us of the description of those days, when, we are told, *the sun was to be darkened, and the moon would not give her light, and the stars would fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens would be shaken.* In fact I have already been led to make use of a similar comparison; and it has been supposed by some of the commentators on this passage, that the physical disasters spoken of in it were intended, as similar phenomena were used by the prophets, to be significant of the destruction of powers and dominions (v). According to this interpretation, there has seldom been a period in history to which this description will apply so aptly as to the last six months. Now, at the very time when these convulsions were taking place, our Lord tells us, *The sign of the Son of Man shall appear in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn; and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And He shall send His angels with a great sound of a trumpet; and they shall gather together His elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.*

You will not surmise, I trust, my Brethren, from my quoting this passage, that I am going to copy the fond, dreamy presumption of those who turn the Bible into a book of divination, and deem that by some fantastical conjuration of texts they can make out the times and the seasons, which the Father, we are told, has put in His own power. But as our Lord's prophetical words referred in the first instance to the events which accompanied the destruction of Jerusalem, and received their first fulfilment then, so have they been fulfilled more than once in the history of the Church since. In the

most calamitous ages, when every earthly power was tottering and falling, when all earthly wisdom was smitten with blindness, and hope shrank into fear, the sign of the Son of Man has come forth in heaven; and, as all the tribes of the earth were driven to mourn, they have seen the sign of the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

The grandest example of this was at the downfall of the Roman empire, when people were foreboding that the world was going to rack, the moral and social terrours in men's minds giving a peculiar significance to the convulsions of the natural world. Yet this very destruction was the means of gathering the Northern nations into the Church. Thus did the sign of the Son of Man then come forth in heaven; and thus did He send His angels to gather His elect from one end of heaven to the other. In this manner, as the destruction of Jerusalem became a powerful cooperating cause in the Christianizing of the Roman empire, so did the destruction of the Roman empire prepare the way for the Christianizing of the Northern nations. Moreover then too one of the means which God made use of for the accomplishment of His purpose, was the mission of the Bishop of Rome, who went to the camp of the Huns, "exposing his life," as our infidel historian himself expresses it, "for the safety of his flock."

Nor are we altogether precluded from understanding how and why these things are so. For, as it is with individuals, so is it likewise ordained for nations, that they too are to enter into the kingdom of God *through much tribulation.* When every earthly strength fails, then are men readier, in the feeling of their own weakness, to look

out for a strength above that which is earthly. When all human wisdom is foiled and baffled, then, in the irresistible conviction of their own blindness, contrasted with the order and beauty which prevails in the universe, they learn more easily that the disorder and confusion and shortsightedness pertain to man, and that there must be another wisdom higher than man's, before which all is clearness and order and harmony. The utter despair of human help leads them to seek Divine help. The crumbling of all the strongest pillars of this world teaches them that they must raise their eyes beyond this world, if they would find pillars which shall never give way. This connexion is declared in our Lord's words, *Then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn:* and they who do thus *mourn*, with a weary, heavy-laden heart, receive the comfort promist to mourners, and see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, dispersing and scattering the clouds, with power and great glory.

The most memorable example of this in later times is the age of the Reformation. But we too are living in the midst of a like age, as did our fathers, like, not merely in the overthrow of earthly powers and dominions, but also in constraining men to the recognition of higher powers, and a higher, indestructible dominion. No one can well be ignorant that the first act of the Revolution,—of which we are now entering on the third act, or, it may be, on the fifth,—full of horrours and calamities as that first act was, has given a graver, more serious tone to men's minds and characters. While it crusht so much that seemed bright and fair on the surface of society, it was a grand sweeping away of much that was hollow and rotten; and, if it brought forth a

number of portentous abominations, it also taught men that life is a solemn, awful thing, and, opening their eyes to the might and depth of evil in the world and in themselves, made them feel the need of a strength far different from their own, to combat that might of evil, and proved to them that, unless the course of human events were controlled and overruled by a superhuman Will, the world would perish utterly. It has often been remarkt that one of the effects which the French Revolution wrought in England, was to fill the churches and doubtless it was a main agent, in God's hand, for producing that religious revival, which, though amid a host of contrary influences, has gone on spreading through Europe during the present century (w).

But this revival was so imperfect; there has been so much of false philosophy mixing itself up with the religious views of the age, so much of pantheistic speculation perverting the simple truth of the Gospel; Faith has been waning away so beneath the broadening light of Science, whereas Science ought rather to manifest the boundlessness of the realms of Faith; the kingdoms of the earth and their glory have so tempted and lured us away from the worship of Him whom alone we ought to serve; the idolatry of riches has spread so widely, albeit we had been taught in manifold ways that he who heaps up riches for himself, heaps them up in a bag with holes; the selfishness of man has become so careless, so prodigal and luxurious and selfindulgent, in spite of our continual experience that selfishness is weakness and misery; the pride of man has grown up again to such a towering highth, notwithstanding all the lessons he had received to admonish him that his befitting posture is

humility; we were again crying out, *Aha! I am strong; I am rich; I am powerful; I am great; I am wise; the whole earth is mine to pamper my lusts, and the sea to bring me whatever I desire from far regions; and the winds themselves are my angels to carry my purveyors to and fro to every quarter of the globe: above all, my mind is triumphing over Nature, and eliciting new forms of power from her, which compell Time and Space to bow down as my vassals before me:* therefore He, whose fan is in His hand, has again stretcht it forth, that He may thoroughly purge His floor, and gather His wheat into the garner, while the chaff is to be burnt up with unquenchable fire.

This, my Brethren, assuredly is the light in which we should look at the events of these days, in their relation to the Church. Every age indeed is an age of sifting for her; and perhaps of all ages the most perilous to her is one of unclouded outward prosperity, when the Tempter comes to her, and offers her the kingdoms of the earth and their glory, if she will fall down and worship him. On the other hand, in an age of worldly trouble and oppression, she is tried, to the end that she may come out purified by the fire. She is tried, that the pure grain in her may be sifted and separated from the chaff. O, how much chaff has been mixt up of late years with all our doings, with all our words, with all our thoughts! How big have our thoughts and our words been! big enough to set the whole world in motion, to make it heave like a woman in childbirth. Yet what have been our deeds? Day swallows up day; year swallows up year: and at the end of a score of years what have we done? what for the advancement of God's

glory? what for the good of our fellow creatures? Have we not been perpetually realizing the fable of the mountain in labour? We have now been enjoying three and thirty years of comparative peace in Europe. What fruit have those thirty-three years brought forth? What are the good deeds, unknown to the doers, of which the Son of Man will remind the children of this generation, when He sits on the throne of His glory, and gathers the nations before Him?

If my business were to preach to you about our own personal spiritual life, of how many kinds of chaff should I have to speak! How many ears, seemingly full and fat, have been growing up within us, ears, which we ourselves may have fondly and proudly deemed full and fat, yet which, when they have been sifted, have proved to be mere chaff! Nor should I have far to seek for abundance of like chaff, if I were to search among our public acts and professions. Let me cite a single instance, not taken out of them indeed, but to which I am naturally led by the foregoing train of thoughts, and which at all events has gained a good deal of notoriety in these last months. You all know the modern revolutionary Trinity, in the name of which the French Republic issues its decrees. Of old it was the custom to inaugurate public acts in the name of the Holy Trinity. The acts of the French Republic come forth under the names of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. The falling off is indeed deplorable enough, from the three Divine Persons to these three abstractions. Yet still the words are good words, grand and noble words, in the fulness of their Christian meaning. But, as the motto of the French Republic, what mere chaff are they! chaff, to blind and to choke the gazing

and gaping multitudes! Liberty, from which every rational man shrinks in dismay to take refuge under martial law! Equality, which would manifest itself in the trampling down of every moral and intellectual distinction, until society became a dead, blank, waste! Fraternity, which, when you lift up its veil, comes forth as Fratricide! The ideas indeed are grand and noble, in their true Christian sense: but, as the idols of the Revolution, they are mere mockeries, by clothing himself wherewith the Spirit of Evil is aping the form of an angel of light.

In this, as in so many other instances, we see, that, what the better spirit of man, groping about amid the darkness of the world, desires and yearns for, he may ever find, in its reality and perfection, among the priceless treasures of the Gospel. For there alone do we find true Liberty,—the Freedom which Christ came to bring us, the Freedom which we gain by coming to the Truth, the freedom from errour, the freedom from sin, the freedom from our own carnal, selfish nature, the freedom from the chains and manacles of the world. There we find true Equality, Equality in the sight of God, the equality of those who are all concluded under sin, and who are called to be partakers of the same redemption, the equality of those who are clothed in the righteousness of Christ, the equality of those who only differ in that He gives to them as He wills of His own, the equality of those among whom the greatest is as the least, and the least as the greatest. There too, and there alone, we find true Fraternity, the brotherhood of those who are called to pray to the same Heavenly Father, the brotherhood of those whose Elder Brother has sat down at the right hand of

His Father and their Father, the brotherhood of those whom He has commanded to love one another with the same infinite love wherewith He loved us. One hardly knows which is more amazing, the ignorance of those who fancied that it was reserved for the French Revolution to summon the world to Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity; or the blindness and stupour of those who could fall down and worship these huge, glaring impostures, when the blessed realities had been set before mankind for more than seventeen hundred years in their heavenly purity and majesty.

It would be easy to point out other bloated parodies of Christian ideas, which have been brought forward by the apostles of the Revolution, such, for instance, as the declaration that all men are now to be made kings, not by the writing of the royal law of liberty on their hearts, but by the rejection and subversion of all law and of all authority. So again it has been blasphemously proclaimed that the Resurrection attained for the first time to its fulfilment in the convocation of the National Assembly (x). But the time admonishes me to conclude. I cannot do so however, without saying a few words on the duties which these awful events impose upon us Englishmen, and especially on us, the ministers of Christ's Church in this singularly favoured land.

Our first duty, every heart must needs reply, is deep thankfulness to God, who has again so wonderfully preserved us in peace and tranquillity, while the whole fabric of society has been shaken and convulst in the other chief nations of Europe. For assuredly we cannot ascribe our preservation to any superior wisdom, or to any extraordinary virtues, in ourselves. When we consider what

poor returns we have made for the many precious talents committed to us, how faithless and negligent we have been as a nation in doing God's work,—when we think of the sins and of the distress with which the whole land is overrun, distress yawning fearfully by the side of the utmost riches and luxury,—when we think how little has yet been done to heal and remove the sufferings of the people, and how those sufferings, if not caused, are frightfully aggravated by selfish carelessness and reckless covetousness, by each man's seeking his own, no matter at what cost to his brethren,—we may well marvel at our exemption from the disasters which have befallen our neighbours; and we should exclaim in penitent adoration, *Not to us Lord, not to us, but to Thy name be the glory and the praise, for Thy mercy's sake.*

But have we any reasonable ground for hoping that this exemption will continue? We know how unstable and frail is the basis on which a large part of our prosperity rests, how the very highth to which we have mounted exposes us to greater falls, to more sudden and violent reverses, how mere caprices of fashion will reduce thousands and tens of thousands in a moment to the brink of starvation. On what then can we rely for the continuance of our safety? On God's mercy? But that will not be shewn forth unceasingly toward those who abuse it, toward those who are not stirred by it to repentance and to reformation. Or shall we rely on our Constitution, on the institutions which we have inherited from our ancestors? It is true, they are of inestimable value in many ways, above all, in the formation of our national character. We have long been wont to regard our Constitution, our political institutions, as incomparably the best

that the wisdom of man has ever devised for any nation on earth; and this our judgement has been confirmed by that of the wisest statesmen in other lands, and by the voice of the nations striving blindly and rashly to grasp on a sudden at something like that which has grown up amongst us in the course of centuries. Yet institutions and a constitution of themselves will not preserve us, unless the spirit which gave birth to them, and has gradually moulded and adapted them to the wants of the people, is still living and dwelling in us. For institutions, even the best, may become dead; and nothing will breed or foster and perpetuate life, except that which has life in it.

Two centuries have now rolled by, since Milton spoke of the peculiar privilege, which had been granted to England, of leading the way in great moral and social and religious reformations. Two hundred years ago, he whose heart and imagination seem to have glowed above those of other men with a fervid admiration and love of England, exhorted and admonisht her, in his own grand words, *Let not England forget her precedence of teaching nations how to live.* "Who (he asks) was it but our English Constantine, that baptized the Roman Empire? Who, but the Northumbrian Willibrode, and Winifride of Devon, with their followers, were the first Apostles of Germany? Who, but Alcuin and Wickliff, our countrymen, opened the eyes of Europe, the one in arts, the other in religion?" If we call to mind what homage has been paid, since the time of Milton, in forein countries to the peculiar forms of our Constitution, what a number of attempts have been made to copy our principal institutions,—our Parliament, our Habeas Corpus

Act, our Trial by Jury,—often without reflexion that institutions lose the main part of their worth, unless they are duly assimilated to the rest of the body politic,—we cannot but recognise still that such a precedence has indeed been marvellously vouchsafed to us. But this precedence, like every other privilege, entails its corresponding duties; and weighty, and solemn, and arduous they are; while our position itself must needs increase the ignominy of neglecting them. Still therefore in these days do we need the voice of Milton to cry out to us, *Let not England forget her precedence of teaching nations how to live.* The vanguard must not slumber at their post. If we are to be the pioneers of the moral and political and social civilization of Europe, we must keep on advancing continually forward.

I spoke just now of the three words which are the idols of the French Republic; and I called them chaff. But nobody sows any seed with the purpose of its bringing forth chaff. Even an idol too bears witness that he who worships it has a yearning after something to worship. Grossly as the true ideas of Liberty and Equality and Fraternity have been corrupted in this modern mimicry, this mimicry itself attests that there is a strong, though blind, yearning and craving after the realities which are thus mimickt. These true ideas, I have said, are set before us in the Gospel; and the realities are to be found wherever the Gospel exercises its healing, fructifying power, but nowhere else. Moreover, as these spiritual ideas, through the might of the Gospel, become moral realities, so are there political and social realities in some measure answering to them. The latter are in the main the produce of the former: nor will they be found in any

sort of eminence, where the moral and spiritual realities are wanting, or where they are decaying. Thus the political and social wellbeing of a nation bears a close analogy and proportion to its moral and spiritual wellbeing.

In England, through the Providence which has overruled the history of our Constitution, we have been allowed to enjoy the first of these prime social and political blessings in higher excellence perhaps than any other people. Individually, socially, and politically, we are more free than other nations; because no people has ever had so clear and strong a practical conviction that true Liberty is not only compatible with, but imperatively requires a full subjection and subordination to Law; wherefore the more complete and spontaneous this subordination is, the more perfect will be our Liberty. So that there is still much to be done, in order to render this subjection in all parts of the land a willing subjection, much in the way of persuasion and instruction, divers things in modifications of our laws and institutions, to bring them into more entire accordance with the reasonable will of the nation.

In like manner, while we make no attempt to overthrow the order of Nature and of society, whereby diversities of gifts and faculties and qualities and attributes are found to prevail universally, the principle of our Constitution, which has been working itself out during a course of centuries, and divesting itself of whatever militated against it, is, that all men are equal in the eyes of the law, and moreover that every profession, every office, up to the highest in the State, is open to every Christian Englishman. Nevertheless we know too

well that enormous inequalities of many kinds exist in England,—not merely such as belong legitimately to a well-ordered polity, in which, as in its heavenly prototype, there are many mansions,—inequalities which are not created by the laws, and which the laws cannot remedy, but which have sprung from one form or other of the lust of concupiscence, and which in the sight of God often amount to iniquities.

For these inequalities the only efficient remedy lies in the spirit of Christian Fraternity, in the spirit which enables us to feel that, whatever possession, whatever privilege we may have, we have not for ourselves, but for those who need it, and that the one true blessing attacht to wealth, of whatsoever kind, is the blessedness of giving. This Fraternity cannot be the creature of laws and institutions. They may cherish it, or afford facilities for it: but, inasmuch as it is a form of Love, it can only spring from the heart. Nay, it never has sprung, nor ever can spring, except from a heart renewed by Christian Faith and Love. Other forms of love may have a root in our natural affections, and may rise in no small vigour from thence. Of this form our natural affections take no note; and many of our natural appetites militate against it. Now what can we say of England in this respect? Can we say that anything like true Fraternity is generally prevalent amongst us? Among those whose hearts are swayed by Christian Grace it does prevail. But does it among the bulk of the nation? Can we assert that there is no truth in the common complaint, that the differences of rank are nowhere more obtrusive and galling than in England?

Now this is a main part of England's appointed task,

if she would not forfeit her glorious prerogative, if she desires to retain her precedence of teaching nations how to live. She must regard it as one of her first duties, and make it one of her primary aims, to realize those grand ideas, for the realizing of which the heart of man is now restlessly craving, of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. She must endeavour to realize them more and more, in all the relations of life, political, social, moral, spiritual. As she has been allowed to lead the way in realizing the idea of true political Liberty, and at least to assert the principle of true political Equality, so must she strive to advance continually in the completer carrying out of these ideas, and to perfect and crown her work, by animating all her institutions, and harmonizing all the relations of life, with the spirit of Christian Fraternity. And when I say that this is the duty of England, I mean that it is the duty of every Englishman, according to the means and opportunities with which God has supplied him for the work. It is the duty of the peer; and it is the duty of the peasant. It is the duty of the merchant and manufacturer; and it is the duty of the artisan. It is the duty of the farmer; and it is the duty of the husbandman. It is the duty of the layman; and it is the duty of the clergyman. Everybody has an appointed field of action and influence; and in that field he ought to look upon himself as God's appointed minister for this work.

To us, my Reverend Brethren, is especially assigned the spiritual part of the work. This is the most important of all, not merely in itself, but also as the only living principle and source of all the rest. We are especially ordained to call men to that truth, which will make

them free,—to admonish them of their equality in God's sight, both as lying under the same sentence of condemnation, and as invited to partake in the same blessed redemption; and we are to tell them continually of their Heavenly Father, of their adoption as His children, of their Brotherhood in Christ Jesus, of their being members one of another, so that, if one member suffers, all members ought to suffer, if one member rejoices, all ought to share in his joy. In fact what is the modern Trinity, thus parodied by the Revolution, even in its best form, except a narrow, superficial expression for the blessed Trinity of Christian Graces, Faith, Hope, and Love. By Faith, and only by Faith, receiving the Truth, do we become free from sin, and from the bondage of the world. Through Hope we are citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, where all distinctions will pass away; for all will dwell in the presence of God, and in the light of the Lamb. And as it is by the love of God, that we, who were aliens from Him, are called to be His children, so through the same love we are no longer aliens and enemies to each other, but friends and brethren; as a symbol of which, whenever a minister of Christ preaches to a congregation, though he may be personally a total stranger to them, though he may never before have set eyes on any one of them, though they may have been separated from him by half the globe, by race, language, customs, colour, he still calls them his brethren.

These duties belong to us at all times, under every aspect of the world and of the Church. But they are forced upon us still more impressively in times of trouble and trial. And that which we are to preach and to teach, we ought also to shew forth in our lives. In these days

we are called more urgently than ever to live a life of Faith, and of Hope, and of Love. Outward strength may fail us: wealth, dignity, learning, the power we may derive from ancient institutions and political supports,—all these may crumble under our feet. But these three cannot fail: Faith, Hope, Love abide and stand fast for ever. The spirit which animated the Archbishop of Paris, ought to live in every one of us,—and so much the more, inasmuch as through God's mercy we have received the faith of Christ in greater purity. We ought all to be equally ready to go forth for the assertion of every divine truth, whatever hosts of enemies the world may marshal against it; and we should ever act under the conviction, that he who would follow the example of the good Shepherd, is to give his life,—and, if so, of course every lesser gift and faculty and possession,—for his Master's sheep. Moreover let me add, recurring for a moment to the former part of this Charge, that, if we are to preach Fraternity to others, we are especially bound to shew it forth among ourselves: and while we seek to attain to Christian Liberty, we must guard, in the spirit of St Paul, against every thought and act which would violate that Liberty in our brethren (Y).

The number of momentous subjects on which I have had to speak today, has compelled me to detain you so long, that I must needs omit the exhortation I am wont to address to you, my friends, who are come as Churchwardens to this Visitation. Indeed what I have already been saying about the duty of every Englishman in these times of trial, concerns you, as well as my brother Clergy. You too are especially called in these times to cultivate and promote Christian Liberty,

Christian Equality, and Christian Fraternity, in all your relations with your neighbours, above all with the labourers whom God has placed under your care. Let every labourer, every man, woman, and child in your parishes, feel that you regard them as your equals before God, as your brethren in Christ. Treat them as brothers; love them as brothers. Your parishes will be bright and blessed spots in the land, if you do. Your labourers will be blessed; but the chief blessing will be that which returns into your own bosoms. And here let me just remind you, that this is the very reason why year after year I have so earnestly exhorted you to get rid of the pews in your Churches; because they are adverse to Christian Equality, and to Christian Fraternity; because they pamper vain distinctions and divisions, and separate us from our brethren, where we ought especially to be united as the members of one body.

To you, to us, to all who love England, and desire that she should not lose her glorious precedence of teaching nations how to live, the events of the present year come with solemn exhortation and warning. When the funeral bell tells us that the spirit of a brother has departed from the earth, it should also remind us of our own sure portion, and admonish us to prepare for it. In like manner the bell, which this year has been continually tolling the destruction of thrones and empires, should remind us also that the throne and empire of England, her wealth, her power, her orderly social state, with all the untold blessings of family life, and friendly intercourse, and manly enterprise, and intellectual activity and enjoyment, which spring from it, have no principle of immortality in them, — that they too may fall and be

confounded with the wreck of other nations. Therefore it admonishes us all, that we are each and all bound to do everything that in us lies, to preserve and uphold the State of England, each according to the means and opportunities granted to him,—to cast out whatever has the seeds of death in it, and to infuse, to propagate, and to foster whatever has the principle of life and immortality (z). We are to do this primarily in ourselves, and next in whatever sphere of action God has appointed for us. Then may it come to pass, that, as the bell, which tolls the funeral knell, has often to change its note, and ring the joyous marriage-peal,—yea, as the funeral bell itself, when it tolls the death of a saint, announces the marriage of his spirit to the Heavenly Bridegroom,—so will these funeral bells, which have been tolling the ruin of Kingdoms and Churches, prepare the Church and People of England for the Marriage-feast of the Lamb.

NOTES.

Note A: p. 6.

My Letter to the Dean of Chichester has been the subject of severe animadversions, especially in a Pamphlet by a person calling himself "a Cambridge Tutor," and in a series of long, elaborate Articles in *the British Magazine*. Of course I was prepared for this. I did not take up my pen on that occasion without counting the cost. But I have not found anything material in the arguments urged against me, which requires any addition to what has been said in the Postscript to the second Edition of that Letter; and I am unwilling to revive an irksome, never-ending controversy on minute points of detail. Nor should I have made this slight allusion to my assailants, except that the writer in *the British Magazine* tries to shew that I myself have been guilty of the sin, with which I have charged the impugners of the Bampton Lectures, by garbling my extracts from them. Had I done so, such an act would be doubly reprehensible in me. But his main ground for the accusation is, that, in quoting a long passage, several parts of which I omitted, "there are no *dots*, or marks of omission" (p. 530). The reply to this is very simple. The omissions are denoted, not by *dots*, but by *dashes*. My accuser indeed says, "the *dashes* would hardly be supposed to have that intention." Yet I know not why, if such be an ordinary mode of designating omissions. So far as my observation has extended, it is the most usual one; though it may be that I have been led to adopt it by its continual occurrence in Niebuhr's Roman History; the precision of that writer, and his reluctance to swell out his notes, making him merely quote those words from the passages he refers to, which bear

directly on the inference he wishes to draw from them. Whether dots or dashes are the commonest mode adopted nowadays by English printers for designating omissions, I know not; nor is it worth while to enquire. At all events the latter are still not unfrequent; and that they were in use two hundred years ago, appears from Milton's *Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing*, where, complaining of the licensers, he says: "If the work of any deceast author, though never so famous in his life-time, and even to this day, comes to their hands for license to be printed or reprinted, if there be found in his book one sentence of a venturous edge, uttered in the highth of zeal, (and who knows whether it might not be the dictate of a divine spirit?) yet not suiting with every low, decrepit humour of their own, though it were Knox himself, the Reformer of a kingdom, that spake it, they will not pardon him *their dash*."

It is so difficult to attain to complete accuracy in such minute points of typography, that the dash by which I meant to mark an omission, may here and there have been left out by the printer, though I am not aware of it. This however is not garbling a quotation. Garbling involves an intentional misrepresentation of the passage quoted, mostly one injurious to the writer, though in my case it would have been otherwise,—a misrepresentation, which, by leaving out certain words, twists the meaning of the passage into something different from the author's purpose. Such an act is a sin against truth, which I have not wittingly committed, and which my opponent, with all his efforts, has not convicted me of. My omissions are of such words as did not seem to bear on the immediate argument for which the passage was quoted, mostly of words which had no significance with reference to any part of the controversy. In a very few cases, it may be, the words omitted might have appeared to call for a separate elucidation. My purpose however was not to write a commentary on every questionable expression in the Bampton Lectures. It was merely to shew that the extracts brought forward, as grounds for the proceedings against the author, gave an erroneous representation of his views,

in a word, that they were garbled. Even as it was, I was under the necessity of making a number of long quotations; and I gladly embraced every opportunity, that I could conscientiously, of curtailing them.

NOTE B: p. 7.

In the discussion which took place in the House of Lords on this subject in February last, the Bishop of St David's, according to the Report in *the Times*, said, that "his right rev. friend (the Bishop of Exeter) had spoken, as if the power which had hitherto been exercised in substance by the Crown, had been an absolute and irresponsible power.—His right rev. friend had forgotten this very important feature in the case, that, when the Crown exercised this power, it was strictly limited as to the object selected for nomination. It was not a power to nominate anybody whom the Crown might think proper: but it was a power limited to a certain known class of persons, who in the eyes of the law were equally well qualified to be the object of nomination. His right rev. friend—had made much too great a distinction between the inferior and superior orders in the Church: he appeared at the moment to have forgotten that there was no ulterior qualification required for the functions of a Bishop, which was not equally required for the functions of a Presbyter. The qualifications required for the Presbyter, and which fitted the Presbyter for the after functions of a Bishop, were the main qualifications: all others were secondary, and comparatively immaterial."

This is an important observation, and quite conclusive as an answer to a case suggested by some alarmists, that, if the power of the Crown were to be exercised without any sort of check, it might nominate a Jew or a Mahometan. Still there is no absolute warrant in the previous ordination, that every person who is ordained Priest will be qualified for the Priesthood. Even with the utmost vigilance on the part of the ordaining Bishops, unworthy candidates may gain admission. Moreover, during the long period

which mostly intervenes before a Priest is raised to the Episcopate, disqualifications, unknown at the time of his ordination, may have become notorious. His life may have been openly immoral; or his opinions, as we have seen happen in so many lamentable instances of late, though previously in unison with the doctrines of our Church, may have diverged from them, whether toward Romanism, or toward Rationalism and Socinianism. Now surely it is not unreasonable to demand, that the Church should have some legal security that a person thus disqualified shall not be placed among her rulers. Nay, the need of such a security is greatly hightened, now that the Prime Minister will no longer be necessarily a member of her body, but may be a Dissenter, a Unitarian, a Romanist, or perchance, ere long, a Jew. This security would be afforded by those very forms, which have just been proved to be nullities, if they were but allowed to become realities. That they were originally intended to be so, is plain, without our entering into a historical demonstration to prove it: for no forms are ever set up in the first instance with the purpose of being empty and powerless. They were meant to have force, however they may have lost it. Nor would the revivifying of those forms invest the Archbishop, as has been contended, with a *veto* on the appointments of the Crown. For the nominee of the Crown would only be rejected in a case where there was decisive legal evidence of his unfitness. The Archbishop would not act discretionally, but judicially, somewhat in the same manner in which a Bishop at present may refuse to institute a priest to a living, when he can shew valid cause for his refusal. But in fact the very existence of such a security would almost ensure its never being called into activity, by preventing the Minister of the Crown from nominating a person whose nomination could be called in question. Vexatious objections, such as were offered in one at least of the recent cases, might be dismist summarily.

NOTE C: p. 10.

The great importance of having regular forms for Trust-deeds, to prevent the evils which would result from carelessness in the mode of drawing them up, is forcibly urged by Mr Henry Wilberforce, in his *Letter to Sir R. Inglis;* though the purpose of that Letter is to impugn the Clauses proposed by the Privy Council. After saying that hitherto the working of our schools "has not in most instances been very materially affected" by the provisions in the Trust-deeds, he adds: "But it were most imprudent to assume that this state of things will be permanent. Daily experience assures us that few legal deeds are operative until after many years. Deeds of marriage settlement are now as general as the marriage of those who have any property; and how few of them are ever consulted, as long as the lives and mutual harmony of the married pair continue!—But should discord and separation arise, or should one or both die, it is changed at once from a dead letter, a mere form, to a living and active law.—Need I add, that, if such a deed contains any inconvenient or unjust provisions, any obscurities or defects,—many years will usually elapse before their existence is suspected? It is when change of circumstances makes a deed important, that its practical tendency is for the first time tested.—Now the Trust-deeds of our schools are strictly their deeds of settlement. We have not yet seen how they will work, whenever circumtances shall arise which shall call them into practical operation. And that such circumstances will arise, and perhaps very speedily, I hold to be unquestionable. It is not merely that, as the original managers pass away, we must look to the Deed to settle by whom they shall be succeeded; but already much has happened to involve the question. Popular education has hitherto been a neglected subject; at this moment all parties are exerting themselves to wipe off this reproach. I heartily rejoice at the movement: may it continue and extend! Still we must not reckon upon the advantages which result from this increast attention, together with the quietness of neglect. Alexander

Selkirk would have been glad of neighbours; but he could no longer have said, *I am monarch of all I survey*. As population increast, he would have found the need of fences, fences moral as well as physical, of title-deeds as well as hedges. In this point of view, the new Minutes of Council have greatly increast the importance of the deeds by which the government of our Church schools must be regulated.—To nominate a master to a school, in which he will hardly obtain daily bread by daily labour,—this cannot be esteemed an enviable act of patronage.—But the office of a master is to be raised. He is to be an educated person: he is to be placed above want: he is to enjoy the prospect of a retiring pension.—Can it be doubted that, as soon as this change is effected, the appointment of the schoolmaster will be regarded as a desirable piece of patronage? The controll of the school will become an object of ambition. Men who delight to figure in parish vestries, will be no less rejoiced to see their names on school-committees.—Under these circumstances Trust-deeds will no longer be a dead letter. Men will enquire, in whom is legally vested the nomination of the Master, the controll and visitation of the school. Our school-deeds will then be tried; we shall see whether they are valid or invalid, whether they secure anything at all, whether those, who, with great public benefit, and great personal sacrifice, now direct our schools, may or may not be excluded by others who desire personal importance or valuable patronage. I think it is certain that, before long, these deeds will become important documents" (pp. 15—17). In this conviction I fully participate; and for this very reason, it seems to me, we owe our thanks to the Committee of Council, for having taken the trouble to provide certain forms, whereby the mischievous effects of ill-constructed Trust-deeds may be precluded. This question is distinct from those which relate to the particular provisions of the proposed forms; and on this preliminary point, I trust, almost all persons who have considered the matter are now agreed.

It has been a great satisfaction to me to find that the view which I have taken through all our discussions on this point, is

confirmed by the excellent Bishop of Salisbury in his recent Charge, pp. 13—15. "On the best consideration,—I am bound to say that it does not appear to me either unreasonable that the State should require a certain constitution of management for schools as the condition of its grants, or injurious to the Church to acquiesce in such a condition, but rather the contrary. I am not now speaking of any specific management clauses, the character of which is a subsequent consideration, but of the general question, whether the imposition of any clauses at all should be resisted by the members of the Church. And as to this I am clearly of opinion, both that the State is entitled to the security thus given as to the manner of the application of its funds; and that the Church, far from sustaining any injury thereby, would, in fact, find in the settlement of such terms protection and security. The State has, I think, a right to expect that some terms of management should be defined; because, when considerable sums of money are to be applied from the public funds for the establishment and maintenance of schools, it is reasonable to require that the schools be constituted on such a basis as to give security for the permanence of their character as public institutions, not liable to be affected by the fluctuations of individual caprice. Those who refuse all recognition of this right, and who require that all parties should be allowed to claim a share in the public money, and at the same time to constitute their schools according to their individual fancies, appear to me to take up a ground incapable of being maintained in dispassionate argument, and which I hope the members of the Church generally will not be disposed to adopt. And this the rather, because the settlement of well-considered terms upon which grants shall be made, is, in fact, a security to the Church against that very aggression which is the subject of apprehension. If the constitution of the school is left in each individual case to be settled by discussion between its local promoters and the Committee of Council, it is easy to see how great a power would come to be exercised by this latter body, even though the right of compulsion were formally withheld. Should those who are

entrusted with the distribution of the public funds be at any time disposed to use the power in their hands for the promotion of any particular object, far more opportunity for this would be given by negociations in detail with the local promoters of each particular school, often little acquainted with the general bearings of the propositions submitted to them, under the influence of hope and fear, not to say, subject to the constraint of their necessities, than is afforded by the deliberate discussion of terms beforehand with an independent body, such as the Committee of the National Society. It is true that, in the earlier stages of the administration of these funds, no such conditions were laid down; and it is also the case that, in previous negociations between the Committee of the National Society and the Committee of Council, the former body have exprest a wish for the continuance of the same freedom; but experience and consideration have, I believe, produced a general conviction in the minds of the members of the Committee of the National Society, that such a demand is neither reasonable nor safe; and that, if the terms themselves be well considered, the necessity of their adoption is not an unsuitable condition in order to the reception of a grant from the public funds."

The same line of argument was taken by the Bishop of Oxford in his speech at the Meeting of the National Society, and by Mr Gladstone, when the question was discust in the House of Commons. Hence I trust that the very unreasonable cry for leaving every one to do as he likes will now die away. Until we attain to that perfect love, which, being one with true wisdom, will ever fulfill the law, we need the help of the law at every step to keep us from erring at once against wisdom and against love.

NOTE D: p. 13.

The Secretary of the National Society in a letter to the Secretary of the Committee of Council on Education, dated May 12, 1846, states that "the Committee of the National Society

are prepared to concur with the Committee of Council in recommending the Clauses to applicants for aid, it being understood that the applicants may select the Clause most adapted to their own case." It is true, he had previously said, that "the Committee of the National Society are desirous that the promoters of education throughout the country should have the same liberty of choice as to the constitution of their Schools, which has hitherto been conceded to them both by the Committee of Council and the National Society." It seems to me however, on the grounds urged in the Charge, and in the preceding Note, that this desire was unreasonable, and that the Committee of Council were quite right in disregarding it, though it was repeated in a letter from the late President of the National Society in November of the same year. Indeed it appears from the Correspondence between the two Committees, as publisht in the last *Monthly Paper* of the National Society, that the Committee of that Society have themselves changed their opinion on this point. For in their letter, dated the 5th of last July, they state that "Experience has convinced the Committee of the National Society, that it is important,—that the conditions on which the Parliamentary grants are made should be fixt and definite, in order to avoid negociations, which individuals are often not well qualified to conduct, at once from their position as applicants for aid, and because their want of familiarity with all the bearings of the subject, as well as other causes, has, in many instances, led, sometimes to imprudent concessions, and sometimes to demands at variance with the real objects of the applicants themselves."

As to the liberty of selecting among the Clauses, it is plain, both from the Correspondence already cited, and from the *Official Letters relative to the Management Clauses* publisht by authority of the Privy Council, that the Committee of Council were always ready to concede this liberty to a considerable extent, where a valid claim for it could be made out. In many cases, as the Clauses were drawn up with special reference to Parishes under widely different circumstances, the transfer of them would have been an absurdity; for instance, the application of the Clause drawn up

for "very small rural parishes" to a parish like Brighton or Marylebone.

I have mentioned the dates of the Letters from the National Society, because one main ground of the complaints and irritation against the Committee of Council has been the notion that their conduct in enforcing the Clauses has not been open and straightforward. Such a notion, with reference to such a body, could hardly have sprung up, except where a strong prejudice was already existing. From the dates just referred to, we see that the Committee of the National Society was acquainted with the Clauses on the 12th of May 1846; and the documents printed among the *Official Letters* prove that they were the subject of a negociation between the two Committees in the course of that year. Yet Mr Wilberforce, whose Letter to Sir R. Inglis bears date June 1st, 1847, says (p. 19): "The Committee of Council have suffered the Church to go on *to the present moment* wholly unconscious that any change has even been contemplated:" and, then, after trying to shew that they cannot have weighed the importance of the innovation, he adds: "I cannot but derive some satisfaction from this consideration; because it enables me to believe that the measure, perhaps somewhat indiscreetly urged forward by the overhasty zeal of some subordinate authority, has not yet received the full consideration of their Lordships.—Could I think otherwise, I must most sincerely lament that the Administration of England should have adopted, upon a subject so momentous as the education of the people of England, *a course of proceeding which an opponent would stigmatize as stealthy and underhand.*" So again the Reviewer of that Letter, in the *Christian Remembrancer* for July 1847, in an Article which puts the worst construction on every measure of the Privy Council, says (p. 161): "*The underhand and irregular way in which this new condition has been imposed,* appears sufficiently in this simple fact, that there is no public accessible document, of any sort or kind, which makes the smallest allusion to it. *It has absolutely no existence except in the letters of Mr Kay Shuttleworth, the Committee's*

Secretary, to this or that individual clergyman, who may happen to have obtained a grant of money for his school. The condition is only known to the individual: the Church, as a body, knows nothing about it." Where such statements found credence, one cannot wonder that a good deal of indignation was excited. But, though the authors of them did not intend to misrepresent the facts, the true state of the case was very different. From the series of letters now publisht, it appears, (*Monthly Paper* p. 11,) that the Committee of Council began in 1845, under the late President, to recommend certain forms of Trust-deeds to applicants for aid. The late President, I have been informed, was strongly urged to bring the matter before the House of Lords, for the sake of obtaining a definite decision on the point, but deferred doing so, probably from wishing to ascertain beforehand experimentally what forms would be best suited to the varying circumstances of particular parishes. In the following year, 1846, the forms recommended by the Committee of Council came under the notice of the Committee of the National Society; and a correspondence, interrupted by the change of Ministry, ensued between the two Committees, in which the Committee of the National Society declared themselves prepared to recommend the Clauses to applicants for aid, under the limitations already spoken of. In September of the same year, the Committee of Council, after adopting an alteration suggested by that of the National Society, state their desire, "that no doubt should exist that the National Society are prepared to employ their influence with the promoters of parochial schools, on all occasions, to procure the adoption of the Clauses:" and they are answered by a repetition of the same declaration, though with the same limitations. Thus the Clauses were a subject of negociation in 1846 with the Committee of the National Society, which has long acted as the organ of the Church in matters pertaining to education, and which declared itself prepared to recommend them to applicants for aid. Surely this was the proper mode of communicating these Clauses to the Church, until the publication of the Minute, which was of course deferred till the permanent

form of the Clauses was conceived to be determined. The long and tangled discussions which have arisen in settling that form, shew how injudicious it would have been to have issued a minute without such a negociation: and what complaints would have been vociferated against the arrogance of the Committee of Council in laying down such rules so hastily and inconsiderately, without consulting the only persons qualified to pronounce an opinion on the proper government of Church-schools! As it was, the Committee of Council might well assume that the Clergy who applied to them for aid, would have been apprised of the Clauses by the National Society, who had promist to recommend them. Surely such words as *stealthy* and *underhand* are wholly out of place in reference to this conduct.

I should hold indeed that grants made anterior to the negociation with the National Society ought not to have been withheld in consequence of a refusal to adopt the Clauses. Whether this happened in any particular case through inattention or mistake, I know not. In that of his own Parish, Mr Wilberforce says (p. 21), "the Committee of Council, after some correspondence, conceded the points for which the local Committee felt it their duty to contend."

NOTE E: p. 16.

A wish was exprest at the Visitation, that I should introduce a few sentences on the benefits which the lay members of the Church would derive from taking a more active part in her various works. One reason for my not dwelling on this topic in my Charge, though I am deeply impresst with its importance, was, that I have often brought it forward prominently on former occasions; for instance, in my Visitation Sermon, *Christ's Promise the Strength of the Church*, pp. 342—345, in my first Charge, *the Better Prospects of the Church*, pp. 24—30, and in Note A to my second Charge, *Privileges imply Duties*.

Here I will only add one remark. The staple argument used in behalf of the Game-Laws is, that they supply an

inducement for the great landed proprietors to reside on their estates. What must be the worth of a cause, which is upheld by such an argument! What must be the character of landed proprietors, who need such an inducement! Nay, what, in times like these, must be their condition! Must they not be on the very verge of extinction? if, with all the healthful and useful and delightful occupations enjoined upon them by the duties consequent on the possession of landed property,—by the duties of cultivating their lands, and all their varied produce, vegetable and animal, and of leading the way in all manner of agricultural improvements, so that the soil of England may be fitted for supporting its ever-multiplying population,—and by the duties of employing their manifold means of wealth and influence for bettering the physical and moral condition of the people on their estates, who by the very tenure of those estates are committed by God to their special charge,—if, with all these solemn duties, with all these blessed means and opportunities of salutary and beneficent action, they can find no motive, no pleasure, no inducement for living on their estates, unless they are allowed to sink their human, moral nature into the similitude of beasts of prey. It may be that this similitude may allowably occupy a part in the microcosm, man. But that it should occupy the chief part in any man! in any class of men! and that these men should be called the aristocracy! History never presented a more glaring instance of her bitter irony. In days like these, when it would seem that God were coming to judge the nations, one might think that such an aristocracy would surely be doomed; were it not that, through His mercy there are better and nobler spirits amongst them, men who know their duties, and love them, and prize them as their highest blessings. God be praised that such men seem to be increasing in number every year! May they still continue to increase! Else the righteous sentence will ere long go forth, that they who reject the duties attacht to their lands, shall have their lands taken from them, that they who choose to be mere Esaus, shall forfeit their birthright and their blessing.

Note F: p. 18.

The correspondence in which this negociation has been carried on, has just been publisht in the *Monthly Paper* above referred to; and from the exceedingly conciliatory spirit shewn by the Committee of Council, in complying with the requests addrest to them by the Committee of the National Society, I trust that the matter will soon be brought to a satisfactory settlement. At present the only point of difference seems to relate to the question of appeals from the decision of School-committees.

The original Clauses, if a difference arises in any Parish between the Minister and the rest of the Committee respecting the religious instruction of the scholars, grant an appeal to the Bishop of the Diocese, whose decision is to be "final and conclusive." In a letter from the Secretary to the Bishop of Ripon, publisht among the *Official Letters,* it is stated (p. 19) that "the correct interpretation of the power given to the Bishop—gives the Diocesan the authority to exclude any book against the use of which an appeal should be made on religious grounds, if that book were found by him to be inconsistent with the doctrine of the Church;" and further, that, "if the teaching of the Master or Mistress were regarded by any member of the Committee as inconsistent with the doctrine of the Church, and that member appealed to the Bishop, the decision of the Diocesan would on this point also be final."

On the other hand, in consequence of a request from the Committee of the National Society in April last that an appeal be provided "in case of differences upon all other points, besides those involving the moral and religious instruction of the scholars, and in particular upon the selection, appointment, and dismissal of the schoolmaster and schoolmistress and their assistants," the Committee of Council, after some correspondence, proposed, as a Board of Appeal for such cases, "that the Lord President of the Council shall nominate as one arbitrator an Inspector of Schools, appointed conformably to the Order in Council dated

10th August, 1840; that the Bishop of the Diocese shall nominate a second arbitrator from among the Clergy of his Diocese; and that these two arbitrators shall in each case select a third person to act with them, being a magistrate and lay member of the Church of England." A provision is added in case the first two arbitrators should not agree in the choice of a third; but the material point is the constitution of the Board of Appeal as already stated. There could not be a stronger proof of the conciliatory spirit with which the Committee of Council have acted throughout. For the Lord President, in the choice of the arbitrator he is to select, restricts himself to the body of Inspectors, who cannot be appointed without the concurrence of the Archbishop of the Province, and who are to be removed if that concurrence is withdrawn. Thus we have every security we can desire for the character of two of the arbitrators; and these two are to choose the third.

When such a Board of Appeal has been granted by the Committee of Council, along with the reservation of all questions relating to religious and moral instruction for the exclusive jurisdiction of the Bishop, it seems greatly to be deplored that the Committee of the National Society should have protracted the settlement of a negociation, which has been beset with so much angry contention, by requesting that the local promoters of schools should be allowed, where a certain proportion of them wish it, to name the Bishop of the Diocese as arbitrator upon every point of difference. As the Committee of Council have definitively refused to comply with this request, I trust it will be withdrawn without hesitation at the next Meeting of the Committee of the National Society.

An impression has indeed arisen, since the publication of the Correspondence between the two Committees in the *Monthly Paper* of the National Society, that the negociation has already failed and been broken off. This impression however, I conceive, has arisen solely from the accidental fact, that the correspondence, as there printed, terminates with the refusal of the Committee of Council to accede to the request concerning the exclusive

jurisdiction of the Bishop. Hence it has been inferred, somewhat precipitately, that the negociation is finally closed: whereas the real state of the case is merely, that, the last Letter from the Committee of Council being dated the 30th of August, and there having been no meeting of the Committee of the National Society in September, that Letter has not yet been taken into consideration. But, as October was also to elapse before the latter Committee would reassemble, it was deemed expedient to publish the correspondence which had taken place, in order that the Church at large might know in what manner the negociation has hitherto been carried on, and to what results it has led. The publication, I believe, has been very timely. Most persons who take an interest in the question, so far as I have had the means of judging, have had their views greatly modified by it; and many who once lookt with alarm at the Clauses, have been convinced that in their present state they will not only be unobjectionable, but beneficial. Indeed there is good reason to hope that ere long all judicious persons will concur in the views exprest by Mr Gladstone, according to the report of his speech in *the Times* for August 19th: "To the general principle of the composition of the Committees of Management he gave his most frank and cordial support.—If they succeeded in making an arrangement of the kind indicated, it would be accepted, not as a compromise, or a choice between greater and less evils; but a very great increase of valuable assistance would be given to the Church in the matter of education, and a very great benefit conferred on the whole of the people."

NOTE G: p. 19.

Those who congratulate themselves,—for there are some such persons,—on the notion that the negociation with the Committee of Council has been broken off, will doubtless maintain that the rupture has not arisen from any jealousy of the Laity, but from a desire to uphold the exclusive rights of the Episcopate. In point of fact however this amounts to the same thing. It

is merely a transfer of the same feeling from the lower degree to the higher, an effort to assume for the Hierarchy, what can no longer be maintained for the lower orders of the Clergy. The Bishops themselves, I should conceive, would much rather be exempted from the decision of such thorny questions as may arise concerning the appointment or removal of school-masters and mistresses. Surely too a magistrate in the neighbourhood would have greater facilities for investigating such questions, at least in parishes remote from the cathedral city, and, if judiciously selected, would be quite as competent to do so. On these grounds it seems to me that the Committee of Council are bound to persist in their refusal, because they are asserting an important principle. In fact they are maintaining the cause of the Church, of the whole Church, against those who would sacrifice the rights of the Church to the Hierarchy.

The chief motive, which induced the Committee of the National Society to urge the request we have been considering,—it would seem from their letter of July 5th,—was, that "a strong desire had been exprest by many members of the Society to name, in their Trust-deeds, the Bishop of the Diocese as arbitrator upon any point of difference," and that "this arrangement would appear to be considered by some as the only one under which they can conscientiously submit Church-schools to the controll of Committees formed under any of the Management Clauses." But, though every conscientious scruple should be respected, so far that he who entertains it should not be subjected to any positive penalty or persecution, such merely personal scruples cannot well be taken into account in legislative enactments. In these we are to lay down what we conclude to be right, on the largest, fullest view of the matter under consideration, without regard to individual whims and delusions. By complying with such, we seldom even attain the end of satisfying and pacifying those who hold them. We must not humour a spoilt child: we only spoil him still more, if we do. The likelier course to correct him will be by firm, steady, straightforward conduct, without noticing his caprices. When the great body of

the Church have adopted the Management Clauses, and are experiencing their beneficial effects, the fanciful scruples, which usurp the name of conscientiousness, will vanish.

NOTE H : p. 20.

They who urge this argument forget that he who lays down a rule, binds himself primarily thereby. This is put very forcibly by the Bishop of Oxford, according to the report of his Speech in *the Ecclesiastical Gazette*. He is contending that, in having certain Clauses to regulate the management of Schools, "we get a safeguard for the Church in dealing with such a body as the Privy Council." For what, he asks, is the fact? "The fact is, that a number of schools in detail accept these Clauses without question, because they feel it of great importance to obtain money to build schools. What then is the Church to do? Is the Church to say, we will leave the question to be decided by the needy applicant for aid, in his particular parish, prest upon by a sense of the need of educating his children, hoping he shall be able to go in the right direction, trying to persuade himself that he gives up no principle? or ought we to say, we will see on what terms you can accept it, binding the Government on one side by these terms, and binding the management of the schools on the other, and thus affording protection against any possible abuses? This is the practical question."

After a careful examination of the whole Correspondence between the two Committees, it seems to me that there is no reason for hesitating to place full reliance in Lord John Russell's declaration in the House of Commons on the 18th of August, that "the Committee of Council have not the least wish to impose any terms which will give the Government further power of interference with these Schools."

Note I: p. 22.

In *the English Review* for June 1847, in an Article on the Educational Minutes of August and December 1846, the writer says (p. 419): "We confidently assert, that there is no person in any degree, whether theoretically or practically, conversant with the subject, but must welcome these regulations with that applause which they deserve, unless he be totally devoid either of candour or common sense. For our own part, we have no hesitation in declaring our mature conviction, that they are the very best which could possibly be produced to meet the circumstances of the case." Some sensible observations follow in pp. 425—427, on the great benefits which are likely to accrue to the English nation, and especially to the Church, from the regulations. The writer's object is to defend them against the Dissenters, and to shew the folly and sin of the Dissenters in impugning and rejecting them. Of course however his remarks will apply with still more force to the Church, who is to be the chief gainer by the regulations, if she allows anything less than an urgent duty and manifest necessity to draw her into breaking off that union and consort from which such blessings may fairly be expected.

Note J: p. 25.

The only objections I have heard of to this Bill, which appear to me of much weight, bear upon that portion of it which provides for a private investigation by the Bishop into the conduct of a Clerk under accusation. There are indeed many cases, which, it seems to me, would be best settled in such a manner, with an avoidance of much scandal and expense. The Act too provides that such proceedings shall not be instituted without the consent of the Clerk, and that sentence shall not be past upon him, unless "by some writing under his hand he confess the truth of the charge, and consent that the Bishop

shall forthwith pronounce sentence upon him." Still it is apprehended by many that fear of the Bishop, and of ulterior proceedings, would induce some Clerks to give their consent, even when they felt themselves innocent. I should hardly think such a case likely to occur in these days: but others are of a different opinion: and in such a matter one is especially bound to distrust one's own judgement.

NOTE K: p. 25.

The only thing like authentic information that has got abroad concerning the intended Test of Heresy, as it has been called, is contained in a letter from the Bishop of Exeter to the Archdeacon of Exeter, which was publisht, apparently by himself, in *the English Churchman*. In this letter it is stated, that, at a meeting of the Bishops, held the day before, to consider the *Clergy Offenses Bill*, a Proviso was proposed to be added to the 3d Clause, enacting "that nothing shall be adjudged in any Court of this land to be heresy, or false or unsound doctrine, on any point treated of—in the xxxix Articles, that is not opposed to the doctrine of the Church of England, as there declared." This Proviso, it is further said, "was not adopted by the meeting of Bishops; but it was announced that such a Proviso will be moved in the course of the progress of the Bill through Parliament." As the other Bishops present took no public notice of this announcement, we may infer that they hoped, whatever they deemed objectionable in the Proviso might be removed by private discussions: for the Bishop of Exeter, in a second letter, written three days after, adds, "that the Proviso—was not proposed by any Bishop, as himself favouring it, but was laid before us in order that we might consider it, as it would certainly be moved in the progress of the Bill through Parliament." Or at all events they knew that it might be averted, as it actually was, by the dropping of the whole Bill. Probably too they were of opinion that the Church had already been sufficiently distracted by the previous controversies of last winter, one of which was still going on with some vehemence; and hence they

might be unwilling to throw in new matter of contention. But the Bishop of Exeter's well-known inflexible love of truth would not allow him to compromise it by any such pacific policy. As soon as he heard of the proposition, which was sure to kindle such a ferment in our Church, he immediately sent off a letter to the Archdeacons of his Diocese, publishing it at the same time to the whole Church through *the English Churchman*, in order that the Clergy might be roused to put forth all their energies in resisting this threatened anonymous innovation.

By the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, the letter of their Bishop would naturally be regarded as a sufficient ground to act upon. But it did not seem to me to be a ground for our adopting any measures in this Archdeaconry, so long as we were left without a similar intimation from our own Diocesan. I thought it would rather become us to wait until the proposition was actually brought forward in some definite form, that we might know what we had to apprehend and to contend against. For the very fact, that it had been laid before a meeting of the Bishops, seemed to imply that its author was desirous of consulting their opinions, and would probably be ready to be guided by them, if not in withdrawing, at least in modifying it. Hence, in my communications with the Clergy of this Archdeaconry, I strongly urged their abstaining from taking any step till we had more precise information concerning the measure which was to be submitted to the Legislature.

It may be replied indeed, that our prepossessions and prejudices in these days are so strong, as almost to unfit us for making use of the most precise information, even when we have it, and that therefore the vaguest serves just as well for us to form our judgements on. For instance, in a short article in *the British Magazine* for the month of May, subjoined to a reprint of the Bishop of Exeter's Letter, we find two objections urged against the announced Proviso,—first, that it would be very wrong to make the Thirty-nine Articles the legal Test of heresy, though they "may fairly be taken as a Test of erroneous and unsound doctrine;"—and secondly, that the measure would tend to lower the authority of the Creeds. From these objections one might suppose that the

objector can hardly have read the Proviso, its purport being that nothing shall be adjudged to be heresy, *or false or unsound doctrine*, but what is opposed to the Thirty-nine Articles; that is to say, heresy when it pertains to points on which errour is deemed heretical, in other cases false or unsound doctrine. He would also seem to have forgotten that the Articles declare that the Three Creeds "ought thoroughly to be received and believed," a higher authority than they venture to claim for themselves. Besides many of the condemners of the Proviso, one may infer from their arguments, must have overlookt that important limitation in it, that its purpose is not to constitute the Articles the sole Test of heresy, or false and unsound doctrine, but merely "on any point treated of in them;" on which, so far as they do pronounce, their decision would of course be held to express the judgement of our Church. So that the effect of the Proviso would probably be to leave our Ecclesiastical Law very much as it is already; since the practice of the Courts has ever been to take the Articles as the canon for determining what is heresy, or false and unsound doctrine, on any point treated of in them: and our other symbolical books would still be consulted as authoritative with a view to the right interpretation of the Articles.

The discussions which have arisen out of this controversy, may doubtless be useful in clearing men's minds on the subjects under debate. I am merely deprecating those public proceedings, by way of remonstrance or petition or address, which ought to follow, instead of preceding these discussions. Such proverbs as *Look before you leap* are valuable prudential maxims, of extensive application even in logic and morals. One should hardly have expected however that assemblies of Clergy would have needed such advice. But the dizzying speed and whirl of our railways seems even to have infected sober men with a desire of darting in a trice from the beginning to the end of their journey. In the proceedings of the rabble this is not surprising: but we have also seen a deliberative Assembly, supposed to contain the wisdom and prudence of the most cautious and considerate people on earth, condemn an armistice off-hand, without examining the negociations

which led to it: and in this instance again the verdict of Philip drunk had to be reverst by Philip sober. May the Clergy at least learn from reiterated experience, if from nothing else, to beware of such precipitation! The most terrible feature about the cholera is its suddenness; and scarcely less pernicious are choleric decisions.

NOTE L: p. 26.

On these grounds I cannot but deplore that a large body of Clergy,—a number amounting, it is said, to seventeen hundred, and comprising a large proportion of the most zealous and devoted ministers in our Church,—should have signed a Petition calling upon the Legislature to pass some enactment equivalent to the Proviso spoken of in the last Note. Surely there is something very inconsiderate in such a Petition. Are the Petitioners willing to abide by whatsoever Parliament may choose to lay down concerning the doctrines of the Church? *No*, they will say: *we merely want them to decide in this one case as we bid them*. But they who call upon a tribunal to decide, thereby recognise the right of that tribunal to decide against them, as well as in their favour, and not in one instance merely, but in all similar ones; and they preclude themselves from urging any objection against its authority. It was through such inconsiderate invitations and appeals, that the Papacy gained a large part of its exorbitant power. In the present matter the Petition is rumoured to have been occasioned by a particular case in which episcopal authority is supposed to have been abused. But, even assuming the abuse to have been flagrant, we have regular courts for the settlement of such questions, where the sentence will be preceded by a long and careful examination into its legal grounds. It betokens a morbid impatience, to turn away from these regular tribunals, and to call for a new law, when things are not going just as we wish.

A like impatience, no less deplorable, it seems to me, has been manifested this year in the Petition to Government to send a Commission to our Universities with a view to reforming their constitution and practice. Not that these are perfect, any more

than other human institutions. There are several things in the practice of my own, the one I am best acquainted with, which I earnestly desire to see changed. But what assurance have I, that a Commission appointed by Government would recommend the changes I wish for? It is far more probable that many of their recommendations would be in an opposite direction, adding, for example, fresh stimulants to emulation, which already is one of our chief banes. Nay, even if I had the power of determining their recommendations, I should deem it incomparably better that the alterations should be made by the voluntary act of the Universities themselves, by those who will have to carry them into effect. For that which we do willingly and on conviction, will ever be better done than what we do on compulsion. The true way of reforming a body is to labour to produce that conviction in them which will lead them to reform themselves. The arm of the Legislature should not be called in, *nisi dignus vindice nodus:* but, like bad playwrights, we call it in at every petty difficulty. While we prate about the omnipotence of truth, and boast that the wheels of the world are now to advance self-moved, like those in the prophetic vision, by in-dwelling intellect, not through the impulse of outward force, never has there been a year in which people have so perpetually called in force to effect what ought only to be effected, and can only be effected well, by intelligent conviction. In other words, every one wishes to impose his own will upon others; few place any trust in reason and right and truth.

There are several cases indeed in which the sanction of Parliament would be requisite, to give legal authority to changes in what is at present establisht by Act of Parliament. For instance, if any alterations were to be made in the Liturgy,—and there are some which almost everybody would admit to be exceedingly desirable,—these alterations would demand the confirmation of the Legislature. Nor could that shameful clause in the Caroline Act of Uniformity, by which the Puritans were expelled from our Church, be modified, as it ought to be, without a like sanction. This obligation follows from our connexion with the

state. The right course however for those who feel the need of any such changes, would be to petition for the summoning of a properly constituted Ecclesiastical Synod, which ought to be the chief agent in all measures affecting the constitution of the Church.

NOTE M : p. 30.

I have been grieved to meet with what I have here termed *a sophism*, and what, the more I examine it, only seems to me more palpably such, used by my dear and honoured friend, the Bishop of St David's. He is one of the persons with whom, as I have said in the Charge, it has been painful to me to find myself differing on this momentous subject. In former years, when we were living in an almost daily interchange of thoughts, and when my mind derived inestimable advantages from the fulness of his knowledge and the imperturbable calmness and clearness of his judgement, our opinions on this question, which was then brought forward by the late Sir Robert Grant, coincided; and I felt a greater confidence in the correctness of mine from its being confirmed by his. Of course there should be nothing surprising in a wise man's changing his views on sundry important points, more especially of practical policy, in a period of sixteen years. Rather would it be an indication of want of wisdom, if he did not. In his speech in the House of Lords, the Bishop appears to impute his former opinion to the influence of those prejudices which have ever been entertained against the Jews, more or less, in every branch of the Christian Church. But as I cannot trace mine to any such origin,—as on the contrary it seems to me integrally combined with the result of all my reflexions on history and political philosophy,—and as I cannot reconcile my recollection of my honoured friend's opinions on this or any other topic with the notion of their having sprung from prejudice, – I feel constrained to stay behind, where we both were in 1832.

The passage I refer to in the Bishop's Speech, as publisht by himself, stands in pp. 21, 22. Having stated that "the old principle of the Constitution was one of absolute exclusiveness,"

and that this principle "has been gradually relaxt, and at length absolutely discarded," he proceeds: "It is therefore not consistent with the real state of the case to represent this measure as an innovation on the Constitution; on the contrary, if there is one thing which has been more clearly proved than another on this question, it is that the barrier which now happens to impede the admission of Jews into the Legislature is the mere creature of accident,—that it was not raised by the Legislature for that purpose, but for one totally different; and it now remains for your Lordships to decide whether it shall have an effect which it was never intended to produce. And therefore, if your Lordships should reject this measure, it will be you who will be making an innovation upon the Constitution, and introducing a principle which does not now exist in it. The principle of this measure is in perfect harmony with the most essential principle of the Constitution. It is an indication of that elastic vigour, flexibility, and expansiveness, which are its glory and its strength."

Now in this passage, as there are some rather startling paradoxes, so I seem to see several fallacies, proceeding in the main from the primary fallacy of assuming that the principle of the Constitution was something negative, instead of positive. Every positive principle does indeed involve a negation, by which it is limited and defined. The faith in One God involves the rejection of all gods but that One. The marriage to one woman involves the forsaking of all others. But if, in reasoning, we proceed from the negative, instead of the positive principle, we may easily lose our way. The principle of our Constitution can never have been "one of absolute exclusiveness," except secondarily and derivatively: for the primary principle of whatever has life in it, must be something positive. The absolute exclusiveness only became a principle of our Constitution, so far as it was necessarily consequent upon the espousal of the nation to that which it regarded as the one Faith of Christ's Church. If we start from this point, we shall take that view of the progressive expansion of the Constitution, which I have attempted to sketch in the Charge, and according to which our Constitution has been gradually

becoming more comprehensive, not by rejecting its primary principle, whereby it was united to the Christian faith, but by adopting a larger conception, under the irresistible pressure of events, as to the necessary constituents of the Christian faith; until at length, in the eye of the Constitution, this became identified, so to say, with the reception of Baptism, and of the Apostles Creed. Looking at the matter in this light, we see that the principle of the Constitution has never yet been "absolutely discarded," as my honoured friend says, but has only been carried out more fully and completely. On the other hand it would be "absolutely discarded" by the admission of the Jews into the Legislature. For that would not be an expansion of the Christian principle of our Constitution, but the total abolition of that principle, and the substitution of its opposite, namely, that our Constitution is no way connected with any form of religion. Though this might not be directly exprest, it would be manifestly implied in that act; nor would it long continue latent, and merely implicit.

Thus we need not be disturbed by the ingenious paradoxes, that this measure is not "an innovation on the Constitution," and that its rejection would be the innovation, and the introduction of "a principle which does not now exist in it." I grant, it has been clearly shewn, that the words by which the Jews are now excluded from Parliament, were not enacted with a view to their exclusion. Nor did the Legislature ever think of setting up a barrier to keep them out, any more than it ever thought of setting up a barrier to keep out an army of icebergs. But surely the words prove, that, at the time when they were enacted, the profession of the Christian faith was deemed an indispensable qualification for a seat in the English Legislature. This was assumed, not as the result of argument, but as a recognised, irrefragable proposition. Nor was there ever a time, until recently, when this proposition would have been seriously controverted.

NOTE N: p. 33.

In a very valuable pamphlet just publisht by Dorner, one of the first divines in the German Protestant Church, on the present condition and prospects of that Church, there are some remarks, which throw so much light on the argument maintained in the text, that I will insert a quotation of considerable length.

"The intimate connexion which has subsisted hitherto in Germany between the State and Christianity is come to an end. Our relation was not that of having a State-Church. A State-Church exists only where the State has identified itself with one of the Christian Churches or Confessions, as the true religion, and therefore confers privileges on this one, in contradistinction from all others. —A State-Church in this sense subsists in England and Ireland, in favour of the Anglican,—in Scotland, of the ancient Scotch Church. It is objectionable, because the various Christian Confessions or Churches are still engaged in a controversy, which no earthly power has a right to regard as decided, since it has not yet been decided by the judgement of History. On the other hand, that Heathenism and Judaism are only subordinate religious stages, History has pronounced. Therefore, when the German State, proceeding hitherto on the assumption that the Christian religion is the one most in accordance with freedom, and looking at what the nations of Europe have become in the light of Christianity, entered into a closer alliance with Christianity, it only did what reason enjoined, not rejecting the teaching of that tribunal which utters its voice in History,—and building upon the principle, which had become an axiom of the European mind, that, among existing religions, Christianity was the only one which could satisfy it, or inspire it with confidence. Hence the same grounds which precluded a State-Church, have hitherto promoted the intimate and legally establisht union of the State with the Christian religion. In fact a State-Church has not even had a legal existence in Germany since the Reformation. The German Empire, in its highest Council, recognises the two Confessions, on

the relative superiority of which History has not yet pronounced its verdict, as entitled to equal rights. In particular provinces of the Empire, it is true, attempts were made for a time, both on the Protestant and on the Catholic side, to exercise the *Jus reformandi* in such a manner, that in each province the State and Church should coincide. But, even in this way, a State-Church was nowhere thoroughly carried out, unless perhaps in Bavaria and Austria, as Wirtemberg, Prussia, and other States prove: nor could it, being checkt by the supremacy over the provinces which belonged to the Empire, wherein the Christian Confessions were entitled to equal rights. At last too, when the German Empire was dissolved by the convulsions consequent upon the first French Revolution, the sovereinty of the Emperor was transferred to the particular Princes in such wise, that almost every German State—comprised both Protestant and Catholic subjects. Thus, as the German Empire had previously admitted a union of Confessions, while the particular Provinces were tending more or less toward a State-Church, the States which survived after the dissolution of the Empire, entered in this respect also into the position and office of the Empire, in that each State, according to the Federal Pact, was bound to recognise and maintain the equality of the Confessions within its territory. Hence, since the Federal Pact, no one has a constitutional right to speak of a State-Church, even in the particular German States.—Yet the State had never till then revoked the favorable judgement, which had been enforced upon it by the power of History, as to the superior fitness of Christianity for the development of the intellectual freedom of its citizens in all ways. Consequently it still recognised its duty of supporting the Christian Churches, as the maintainers of the Christian religion, after its own fashion, and thus of promoting its own ends. Till then religion was not regarded by the State as a mere private affair, which lay wholly out of its sphere, nor the Church as a private society, which it had at the utmost to watch over as a matter of police: but it declared by its laws, that religion generally, and the Christian religion more especially, remote as it may be from the power and office of the State to produce this by any means of its own, or to exercise a

positive, internal rule over it, yet has a side, whereby it is entitled to be regarded and respected as of public and national concernment. Till then the State acted on the assumption that the people at large and as a whole, the people that supplies its materials for building, as well as its master-builders and householders, is, and purposes to be, a Christian people, and consequently that, out of its free conviction, it gives a preference to laws and institutions, which, by their origin and their upholders, afford a pledge of a Christian spirit above all others, and that under such, though it may feel somewhat less like a cosmopolite, it feels more at home.

"Our venerable John Gerhard has said, that 'those who would restrict a government, especially a Christian one, to the task of providing for the outward welfare and tranquillity of this life, deserve about as much attention as if they were to call a magistrate a cowherd or a shepherd.' By this broad irony, this great man exprest the same truth, which that celebrated Englishman, Thomas Arnold, has exprest in a more refined manner, when he censures the Independents for wishing to degrade government into a mere system of police. Gerhard's words are the more striking now, when the Materialism which aims at a soul-less, idealess State, and which has no perception for anything beyond the interests of earthly prosperity and power, has advanced to such a pitch of unintelligence, that it regards the degradation of the State, the destruction of all its ideal aims, not as a loss, but as a progress in freedom, whereas it is only a progress in licentiousness.—This dream is no better or worse, than the other that this materializing notion of a State is the newest, last, ripest result of the development of mankind, from which the golden age is to take its start. Yet new it is not. It was brought forward in its purest form, and even with unction, and became current, at a time at the thought of which, if at anything, our modernest sages cross and bless themselves. For the doctrine that the State is a wholly profane and godless thing, that it is merely subservient to our temporal interests and wants, and that its legitimacy proceeds solely from power, from majorities, from will, or from cunning, was asserted in the middle ages, in the very period of thickest darkness,

by the mouth of the Popes. The novelty is merely that we are now called upon to pick up as a jewel from the ground, what fell as a word of cursing from the High Priest at Rome, to count it a blessing, and to extoll it, every one of us, as a miracle-working charm, which is to heal all the evils of the age, and to plant a Paradise, less fugitive than the last, upon earth.

"The higher, spiritual idea of the State is one of the most glorious acquisitions which we owe to the Reformation. The State, according to the Protestant conception, is not a godless, soul-less thing, but has somewhat of a divine dignity, and takes part, though within the limits of its idea, that is, as an institution of national law, in promoting all the objects of humanity. Hence it is not surprising that till recently, in spite of all the hostile powers which were visibly marshaling themselves against us, we hoped to preserve this higher idea of the State, at least in Protestant countries, from the ever spreading confusion and whirlpool of the age. But in vain. It was to become plainer and plainer, that the great flood of modern history, which began long ago in England, then diffused itself in North America and France, and is now hastening to its termination in England, as it seems to us, with the approaching separation of the Anglican State-Church from the State, was also to drag us irresistibly toward the same goal. The farsighted, if they tried to withstand this, could only regard themselves as Cassandras.—

"Once already in the age before Christ, and immediately after Him, did the degenerate religion of the Jews, promoting the confusion of religions both at home and abroad, manifest itself as a corrosive, contributing, though false in itself, to the undermining of other religions, which had become falsehoods, and hastening their ruin. In our age again Judaism, having grown hollow, exercises a like corrosive power. In the Prussian Diet of 1847, it was by the Jewish Question that the decisive breach was made in the establisht order of things. Among those who took part in the assault, very few were probably capable of surveying the consequences of what they were doing. There are many who joined in this work, without intending

thereby to overthrow the Germanic Christian State; some, who fancied they were promoting its welfare, whether from supposing that the Jews are already in fact Christians, or that they would have been so long ago, unless they had been hardened and cast back upon themselves by their civil disabilities. This however would not of itself have carried the day. Assuredly the purpose of the Assembly was not to raise the Jews to a perfect equality, out of the notion that the unchristianizing of the State would be subservient and was necessary for the Christianizing of the Jews. The real question, if I see rightly, was very different. It did not turn on the Jews, those who have not degenerated from their determinate nationality, and their determinate faith. The Jewish Question served merely as an occasion and signal for a question of general principles. Is Christianity, now that full civil rights have been granted by the Federal Pact to each of the principal Christian Confessions in every German province, but have been no less decidedly withheld from those who are not Christians, still to retain this pre-eminence in our national legislation? Or is the State, as such, henceforward to be indifferent about every existing definite religious Confession, nay, as to the existence of a religious Confession at all? This was the real gist of the question. Had it merely related to the equalization of the Jews, with their peculiar faith, it would clearly have been impossible to avoid the previous question, whether the Jews, as a nation, felt any desire for this equalization, nay, whether their faith would even allow them to accept it. No, it was not the Jews, as a nation, clinging devoutly to the religion of their fathers, and who deserve no degradation for so doing, but who at the same time feel no wish for an equalization and national union, that excited the warm philanthropic interest, which magnanimously, without ever being askt, desired to incorporate them in our national and political commonwealth.—No, let us confess it, the purpose was not to deliver Judaism, as such, from its Ghetto: but men bethought themselves that the Christian Confession, for very many who in name belong to the Christian people, had

become narrow and oppressive, yea, a Ghetto, out of which however they could scarcely step, without losing their civil, or at least their political rights. To come out, or to help others out, of this uncomfortable state, this state of falsehood, where a man's heart contradicted his name, and his faith belied his Confession,—to make civil and political rights independent of every Confession,—this was the point at issue in that memorable conflict.

"The result of the conflict, it is known, was, that the highest political rights were still restricted to the Christian name; a concession to Christianity, the import of which was much diminisht, when one saw what the Assembly regarded as Christianity. By the officers of the State and of the Church, the German people, as a whole, had hitherto been accounted Christian. Every one who was a member of the German nation, and not a Jew, was set down in tables, lists, registers, passports, as belonging to the Christian religion, and one or other of her Confessions. It is true, that, along with this official Christianity, the officers of the State and of the Church could not but perceive that a dangerous religious indifference or scepticism had penetrated through every religious community,—that many felt themselves inwardly destitute of a religious home,—and that these discontented persons, who previously had only existed insulatedly, were attempting to combine, in the press, in assemblages, in addresses, in sects, against the establisht order of things. But a hope was still cherisht, that these unconfessional elements might be suppressed without a general rupture, and might be won over by a spiritual process, if our religious life, which had for years been gaining new strength, and our renovated theology were allowed to exercise their healing powers, and by devoted love to reclaim these spiritual wanderers. It was to be made manifest however, equally in Roman Catholic and in Protestant countries, that we were living under false assumptions, if we thought that this chasm between the outward and the inward could be healed without an open rupture. This became evident in Prussia on the 18th and three following days of March this year, and is equally so in the rest of Germany. Yes, so it is: and, in order to clear up

our present chaos, it is absolutely necessary to acknowledge frankly and openly that those were deceived, who imagined that the State, as such, was still aware, that, to be what it is, safely and permanently, it ought to be Christian. It was a gross lie, that the materials out of which the State seeks stones and architects for its buildings, were a Christian people, or even one that paid homage to the principles of Christianity. So far was this from being the case, that our people, though bearing a Christian name, yet in the body of its representatives had even lost the comprehension of our precious institutions, of their advantages, and of their defects. How then could it defend them with spirit, with courage, with intelligence? or whence could it obtain energy for such a reform as could alone have prevented their ruin, if it had been an act of the national mind? No: these institutions of the Germanic Christian Commonwealth, every one, even the most shortsighted, must perceive, had long been devoted to destruction. It was no peculiar plan or ill-will on the part of individuals that produced the crisis: the force of circumstances, which had long been gathering around us from without, like a tempest, more and more rapidly, came upon us with an inevitable doom.

"The complete civil and political equalization of all religious Confessions, which was proclaimed in the Address of the King of Prussia to his people and to the German nation on the twenty-first of March,—and which has already received its sanction from the German Diet, with reference to the elections for the National Parliament,—has effected a complete change in the previous order of things; not by laying down that equal services or duties shall henceforward have equal rights,—for this would be mere justice,—but that all shall have the same rights without the same duties. Hitherto political rights resulted from the duty, which was regarded as axiomatic, of acting for the benefit of the people, including its Christian benefit, and for the institutions which minister thereto, to the best of our knowledge and conscience, in a Christian sense and spirit; for instance, in matters of legislation and administration, in which Christian interests are so

deeply concerned. The obligation of this duty might indeed be contravened often enough in point of fact; but it was an establisht principle, so long as he, who was to exercise political rights in our Commonwealth, had to declare himself bound to Christianity by a Christian profession. At present, on the contrary, all rights are given to all, without similar obligations. For those who are not Christians, are not capable of undertaking and discharging Christian duties; yet they enjoy the same rights. Therefore, if the duties were still recognised, as of yore, they would be exempted from them, privileged. But in point of fact these duties are no longer recognised: the State, as it is at present, no longer expects them even from Christians. Hence we have no ground for complaining of an exemption and privilege granted to those who are not Christians; nor have we to contend as to the principle that similar duties should have similar rights answering to them. This would not have produced any important changes. The momentous novelty is, that the State has been compelled to surrender its principles to the pressure, which, under the pretext of demanding an equality of rights for all, has in fact demanded its own emancipation from, and that the State, as such, should give up, what I have above described as an axiom of European civilization hitherto, and as a principle of our public conscience. Herewith it must be reduced to the necessity of abandoning a number of the highest tasks of mankind, in which it had hitherto taken part after its manner, and which are intimately connected with the aims of the Christian Church. It is indeed conceivable that the State, even after this enormous revolution, after this overthrow of institutions which have subsisted for fifteen centuries, might still retain its hold on those tasks, and, even in its present condition, desire to exercise the same kind of power over the Christian Church. But then the question would be, whether the State would not pass over from its present legally establisht position of indifference toward Christianity, into that of hostility toward it. I would not be misunderstood. I do not complain that the separation of the State from the Church has taken place. I do not deny that in the present condition of things

it was necessary. Still less would I plead in behalf of a compulsory political Christianity, which would transform a moral or conscientious obligation into a legal one. On the contrary, when the abovementioned discrepancy between the outward confession of Christianity and the inward feeling was actually existing, and could not be removed by any spiritual remedies, as is now clear, I am quite content that the true condition of things should have become manifest; and I give my hearty assent to that separation. Still I cannot regard it as a benefit in itself; readily as I acknowledge that, in the connexion between the Church and the State hitherto, there were many remains of their medieval or Byzantine confusion, which required to be swept away. What I deplore, is only, that the great axiom of our European political wisdom, the conviction that all men are bound to Christianity, to the true fear of God, has become extinct, or at least has been shaken to such an extent, in the German people,—that religion and Christianity have become for so many a mere matter of individual liking. The pulse of our Christian life has grown languid in the German people; and therefore has a degenerate Christianity and Judaism become so frequent; therefore have so many rejected that axiom, and withdrawn, from the atmosphere, which formerly surrounded our domestic life, protecting and purifying it from childhood down to old age."

The reader will of course bear in mind that Dorner is speaking throughout from his own national point of view, and, in what he says of Christianity, treats of it solely in its relation to the State, and as the most powerful instrument for the political and moral improvement of mankind. With this proviso, I think it will be perceived how nearly allied the questions which have been agitated in Germany, are to that which has recently been stirred in our own country, and how forcibly many of his remarks bear upon the latter. Through God's mercy we have been preserved from that dismal condition, into which he represents the German nation as having fallen, and the fruits of which we see in every newspaper. May God still preserve us from it, and from every measure which might lead us toward it! from every measure which

might tend to weaken the Christian character of the Nation, to withdraw the Nation from its sole, exclusive allegiance to Christ!

NOTE O: p. 34.

That the recent Bill is merely a continuation of divers previous measures, is maintained, not merely by the Bishop of St David's in the passage quoted above, but also by Mr Gladstone in his Speech, and in the Preface to it, as well as by most of the other supporters of the Bill, both in and out of Parliament. That this view is fallacious, and where the fallacy lies, has been shewn, I trust, in Note M. Yet, unless one knew how ready we all are to adopt any argument which favours our cause, it would seem strange that anybody should overlook, what an enormous leap it is from our present position, where a profession of the Christian faith is required as indispensable for a seat in the Legislature, to one in which any person may enter it without such a profession.

It is argued indeed that the transition from a Unitarian to a Jew is not very material, with reference to the Catholic faith. The Unitarian however, as such, and by the profession required of him, confesses, at the lowest, that Jesus is the greatest of all moral and religious teachers, that He had an immediate divine mission, that He came to bring life and immortality to light. He acknowledges the resurrection of Jesus as the first-fruits and the evidence of our resurrection. He takes the Gospel as the supreme code of all morality. Now that to which the State from its position is bound to look chiefly in every form of religion, is its moral aspect. As it has been well exprest by a German writer, Marheineke, "In the Church morality is contemplated as piety; in the State, piety as morality." As the acceptance of the Koran, and the common relation to Mahomet, form a distinctive bond of union among all Mahometan nations and tribes, so is there a similar bond of union, in spite of all differences, however momentous these may be, whereby all persons accepting the Gospel for their highest, divinely inspired code, and attaching themselves to Jesus as the highest, divinely inspired

Teacher of mankind, are at once bound together, and separated from the rest of the human race.

This great essential distinction has not been sufficiently attended to by the Bishop of St David's, when, in trying to reduce the difference between Unitarians and Jews to a minimum, he says (p. 10) that, in regard to the denial of the Divinity of our Lord, "they stand upon the same footing." This again, it seems to me, shews how easily we slip into fallacies, when we adopt the negative scale in reasoning, when we class people by what they deny, instead of by what they believe. Even ecclesiastically, though the Church has been too apt to take the former course, the latter is that of Christian wisdom. As to the State, the concerns of which do not lie in the region of dogmas, or of our inward spiritual life, but in that of our moral life, surely there is an enormous interval between those who, by their profession, declare that Christ is their one Divine Teacher and Lawgiver, the Bringer of mankind out of darkness into light, and those who deny these His special claims and dignities, nay, whose distinct nationality rests upon that denial; though certain individuals amongst them may be led by the influences of our recent philosophy and literature, which in many have almost undermined their peculiar religion, to allow that he was "a teacher of pure morality." The two modes of thought, at their extreme proximate limits, may be nearly contiguous; and yet the difference between them may be of the utmost importance, as the Bishop of St David's himself admits just before: his admission however, if duly appreciated, it seems to me, would have shewn that his attempt to pare down the difference, though interesting in reference to the history of Jewish philosophers, is of no moment with regard to the practical question before us.

Moreover, it is well observed by Mr Gladstone (p. 11), that "The law can only deal with what is tangible. A creed, in its sphere is tangible: it has a historical as well as a theological form and body. Even a name, in its own distinct sphere, is tangible too; and Parliament may, if it thinks fit, legislate for names." For names are not mere names, even when they are used falsely.

While they are witnesses against him who uses them, they are also witnesses of the value of that which he dishonestly usurps. Much more is a name worth, when it is assumed in sincerity, as that of Christians is by Unitarians, when they who assume it hold it to be precious, and contend strenuously for their right to it. As the Legislature in all its acts is compelled to look at that which is outward, and as it has no test for ascertaining what spiritual reality corresponds to the outward appearance, it may, not unreasonably, feel itself warranted in taking the profession of a Christian faith, as the criterion for the eligibility of its members. Hereby, at all events, it asserts the Christian character of the nation, and, along with its Christian character, its Christian duties and obligations. It acknowledges itself to be bound by those Christian duties and obligations. It acknowledges that the highest object of all national, as well as individual aim, is the establishment of the kingdom of Christ upon earth.

Besides, there is another very weighty difference. The members of all our Dissenting bodies, who have become eligible to Parliament by the repeal of the various Test Acts, are Englishmen. The Jews are not Englishmen, but Jews. The former are united to us, not only by the profession of a common faith, and by the innumerable intellectual and moral and spiritual ties, which spring from that faith, even with every allowance for all its diversities; but they are also bound to us by race, by numberless domestic and familiar and social links, by community of habits and customs and institutions, by the inheritance of a common ancestry, by sharing in the same national glory, by "speaking the tongue which Shakspeare spoke," by "holding the faith and morals which Milton held." All these common possessions we have; and hereby we are trained for acting unitedly in the present, and for seeking common aims in the future. The Jews, on the other hand, are not connected with us by any of these ties. They have not associated with us: they have not intermarried with us. They have no sympathy with our English feelings: they have no portion in England's glory. Above all, they are far more closely connected with the members of their race in other countries,

than with the English nation. They do not belong to the staple of England's strength and wealth. They are not rooted in her soil. They are not bound up with anything that is permanent in her. They might strike their tents tomorrow, and pass away, and would if they could better themselves by it. The one great object of their aim and pursuit is that which is most purely personal to the outward man, and which can be transferred with the greatest facility from one end of the world to the other. They may be called the currency of the human race.

It may be rejoined, that many of these defects have arisen from our institutions, which for a long time precluded them from taking a firmer root in our soil. Be it so. This might be a valid reason for repealing many of their minor disabilities; but it is no reason for admitting them at once to the highest offices in the State. If in the course of two or three generations it should appear that the Jews, through the enjoyment of English civil rights, have been brought to amalgamate more with English habits and feelings, and to identify themselves with the permanent interests of England, this would, so far, be a strong reason for raising them from a lower step to a higher. But even on this civil ground at present they have no claim to higher privileges. When this amalgamation has taken place, which will hardly be without their imbibing much at least of the moral influence of Christianity, it will be for the statesmen of those days to consider in what manner the religious character of the English nation shall still be upheld, along with the most conscientious discharge of every social obligation.

A further important distinction, merely taking a political ground, is, that the various Dissenting bodies, being sprung from English blood, have a hereditary claim to share in the political rights of their countrymen: and this claim is all the greater, because they were deprived of it, many of them, in consequence of that most unrighteous enactment in the last Act of Uniformity, which drove their fathers out of the Church. For this national crime we were bound to make atonement. On the other hand, though the exclusion of the Romanists arose rather from the crimes of their own ancestors, the time was at length come, when it was

fitting that the great national wound, which had been bleeding for more than two centuries, should be closed. But our Jewish settlers have no claim of the kind. They came amongst us as aliens. They have traded amongst us as aliens, for their own personal ends. They have had the protection of the laws for themselves and their gains; and this has been an ample compensation for the share they have taken in bearing the burthens of the State.

To me too, I confess, there seems to be no little force in the argument alluded to by Dorner, where he speaks (p. 96) of " the previous question, whether the Jews, as a nation, feel any desire for these political rights, nay, whether their faith would even allow them to accept such." Indeed this their faith, so long as they retain it, must needs preclude their ever becoming one in heart and soul with any other people. By this itself they are kept distinct and separate. Nor is it enough to answer, with the Bishop of St David's (p. 25), that " a similar remark would apply to many bodies of Christians,—who consider the Apostle's language, *Here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come*, as still applicable to their own circumstances, and who are prevented by their religious scruples from taking an active part in public life." For such scruples in individuals are no reason for withholding political rights from the great Christian body to which they belong; nor do they give those who hold them a separate interest from that body. Whereas the faith of the Jews does. It is true, that at the court of Pharaoh, at that of Nebuchadnezzar, at that of Darius, they made great and excellent ministers. But then their religion and their moral code were in the van of the nations over whom they were set, while now they would be far in the rear. At all events this reduces the body, for whose sake the Christian principle of our Constitution is to be sacrificed, to little more than a knot of persons, whose lives have been spent, with no slight success, in picking up the dust of the river Pactolus, and who, in the very act of entering our Parliament, are, to a certain extent, sacrificing their distinctive faith and nationality, yet without adopting ours. I will not enquire what prognostics

may be drawn from this as to their fitness for exercising a legislative office.

Note P; p. 34.

I know not whether Dr Arnold ever exprest his opinion on the Jewish Question publicly, except in the Postscript to his Pamphlet on the Principles of Church Reform. In this he asserts that the founders of the Protestant Church of England considered the Church and the Nation as identical. "The Christian Nation of England was the Church of England;—the head of that Nation was for that very reason the head of the Church;—the public officers of the Nation, whether civil or ecclesiastical, were officers therefore of the Church;—and every Englishman was supposed to be properly a member of it,—baptized into it, almost as soon as he was born,—taught its lessons in his early childhood,—required to partake of its most solemn pledge of communion,—married under its sanction and blessing,—and laid in the grave, within its peculiar precincts, amidst its prayers and most affectionate consolations. And is it indifference or latitudinarianism to wish most devoutly that this noble, this divine theory, may be fully and for ever realized?

"It is objected to this doctrine, that it implies the exclusion of those who are not members of the Church from the civil rights of citizens. I think it does imply such an exclusion in the case of those who are not members of the Church of Christ: nor should I consider a Christian nation justified in forming a legislative union with a nation of Jews, or Mahometans, or Heathens. If the citizens of the same nation are in nearly equal proportion Christians and Heathens, the State in that country is not yet sufficiently enlightened to become a Church;—and it is here that our Lord's words apply, that His Kingdom is not of this world. Christians have no right, as such, to press the establishment of their religion to the prejudice of the civil rights of others. Yet, if the two religions happened to be for the most part locally divided, it would be a reason why such a nation should separate itself into

two, and the Christian and Heathen portions of it form each a State distinct from the other. But when the decided majority of a country become Christians, so that the State may justly become a Church, then the Heathen part of the population ought to be excluded from the legislature, and encouraged, if it be possible, to emigrate to other countries, if they complain of not participating in the full rights of citizenship. At present in England, I should earnestly deprecate the admission of the Jews to a share in the National Legislature. It is a principle little warranted by authority or by reason, that the sole qualification for enjoying the rights of citizenship should consist in being locally an inhabitant of any country. But all professing Christians, of whatever sect, as being members of the Church of Christ, must be supposed to have much more in common with each other, as far as the great ends of society are concerned, than they have points of difference. Their peculiar tenets therefore need form no ground for their exclusion."

The same principles, though without distinct reference to the Jews, were asserted in the Preface to the third volume of his Thucydides. "That bond and test of citizenship, which the ancient legislatures were compelled to seek in sameness of race, because thus only could they avoid the worst of evils, a confusion and consequent indifference in men's notions of right and wrong, is now furnisht to us in the profession of Christianity. He who is a Christian, let his race be what it will, let his national customs be ever so different from ours, is fitted to become our fellow-citizen. For his being a Christian implies that he retains such of his national customs only as are morally indifferent; and for all such we ought to feel the most perfect toleration. He who is not a Christian, though his family may have lived for generations on the same soil with us, though they may have bought and sold with us, though they may have been protected by our laws, and paid taxes in return for that protection, is yet essentially, not a citizen, but a sojourner: and to admit such a person to the rights of citizenship tends in principle to the confusion of right and wrong, and lowers the objects of political society to such as are merely physical and external.—It is considered in our days that

those who are possest of property in a country ought to be citizens in it: the ancient maxim was, that those who were citizens ought to be possest of property. The difference involved in these two different views is most remarkable."

To some persons it may appear inconsistent, that so ardent a lover of freedom, so strenuous an advocate for the abolition of the civil Disabilities imposed upon the Dissenters and Romanists, —the writer of a pamphlet bearing title, *The Christian Duty of conceding the claims of the Roman Catholics*,—should have taken what they will deem so opposite a course with regard to the Jews. In fact however it was for this very reason, because he was acting throughout on a clear, definite principle, because he felt that the concession of equal civil rights to all bodies of Christians was a Christian duty, that he was so earnest in resisting the misapplication of that principle, and the perversion of that duty, by extending them to the Jews. Politicians like Sir Robert Peel and Mr Gladstone, who did not act on a similar distinctly recognised principle, and with a similar conviction of Christian duty, but who, having resisted the removal of disabilities from Dissenters and Roman Catholics as long as they could, turned round at length, under a conviction of the mere practical necessity of conceding them, may not unnaturally be less clearsighted with regard to the difference between the two cases. Having withstood one concession and another till they were forced to grant it, they are merely going the same round again, when, having opposed the removal of the Jewish disabilities a few years ago, they are now strenuous in advocating it. How strong Dr Arnold's convictions on this point were, appears from several passages in his publisht Correspondence.

The first occurs in a letter to me, written in 1834. "I must petition against the Jew Bill, and wish that you, or some man like you, would expose that low Jacobinical notion of citizenship, that a man acquires a right to it by the accident of his being littered *inter quatuor maria*, or because he pays taxes. I wish I had the knowledge and the time to state fully the ancient system of *πάροικοι, μέτοικοι*, &c., and the principle on which it rested; that

different races have different *νόμια*, and that an indiscriminate mixture breeds a perfect *colluvio omnium rerum*. Now Christianity gives us that bond perfectly, which race in the ancient world gave illiberally and narrowly: for it gives a common standard of *νόμια*, without observing distinctions, which are, in fact, better blended."

To a like effect he wrote to Sir John Coleridge: "The correlative to taxation, in my opinion, is not citizenship, but protection. Taxation may imply representation *quoad hoc;* and I should have no objection to let the Jews tax themselves in a Jewish House of Assembly, like a Colony, or like the Clergy of old; but to confound the right of taxing oneself with the right of general legislation is one of the Jacobinical confusions of later days, arising from those low Warburtonian notions of the ends of political society."

Again in 1836 he wrote to Mr Hull: "I want to petition against the Jew Bill; but I believe I must petition alone.—I want to take my stand on my favorite principle, that the world is made up of Christians and non-Christians. With all the former we should be one; with none of the latter. I would thank the Parliament for having done away with distinctions between Christian and Christian; I would pray that distinctions be kept up between Christians and non-Christians. Then I think that the Jews have no claim whatever of political right. If I thought of Roman Catholicism as you do, I would petition for the repeal of the Union tomorrow, because I think Ireland ought to have its own Church establisht in it; and if I thought that Church Antichristian, I should object to living in political union with a people belonging to it. But the Jews are strangers in England, and have no more claim to legislate for it, than a lodger has to share with the landlord in the management of his house. If we had brought them here by violence, and then kept them in an inferior condition, they would have just cause to complain; though even then I think we might lawfully deal with them on the Liberia system, and remove them to a land where they might live by themselves independent: for England is the land of Englishmen, not of Jews."

About the same time he wrote thus to Archbishop Whately:

"I have read your additional remarks on the Jew Bill, and grieve that there should be so much difference between us.—For the Jews I see no plea of justice whatever. They are voluntary strangers here, and have no claim to become citizens, but by conforming to our moral law, which is the Gospel. Had we brought them here as captives, I should think that we ought to take them back again; and I should think myself bound to subscribe for that purpose. I would give the Jews the honorary citizenship, which was so often given by the Romans,—that is, the private rights of citizens, *jus commercii et jus connubii*,—but not the public rights, *jus suffragii* and *jus honorum*. But then, according to our barbarian feudal notions, the *jus commercii* involves the *jus suffragii*; because land forsooth is to be represented in Parliament, just as it used to confer jurisdiction. Then again I cannot but think that you over-estimate the difference between Christian and Christian. Every member of Christ's Catholic Church is one with whom I may lawfully join in legislation, and whose ministry I may lawfully use, as a judge or a magistrate. But a Jew or Heathen I cannot apply to voluntarily, but only obey him passively, if he has the rule over me. A Jew judge ought to drive all Christians from pleading before him, according to St Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 1."

NOTE Q: p. 35.

Thus Mr Gladstone (p. 36), in replying to Lord Ashley, who had deservedly attacht great weight to the authority of Dr Arnold, says of the latter: "I apprehend that his view of this particular question stood related, not to the strength of his mind, but to its weakness. Most excellent and most able as he was, yet, like many other men of remarkable and rare ingenuity and of true enthusiasm, he had his own theory which he idolized, which it was the dream of his life to rear into actual existence, and with respect to which no experience could avail to undeceive him. He considered that in a Christian country the State and the Church ought to be regarded as one, the State belonging wholly to the

Church, and the Church belonging wholly to the State." Then, after giving a somewhat overstrained picture of this theory, the merits of which I cannot stop to vindicate or discuss, Mr Gladstone adds: "Dr Arnold's opinion, that the Jews should be excluded from Parliament, was an opinion entertained by him, not with regard to their separate case upon its own merits, but rather, I think, as necessary to the integrity of this favorite, but very peculiar and arbitrary theory."

Now in this reply, if it can be called such, the whole force of the argument lies in the assertion that Dr Arnold's was a "very peculiar and arbitrary theory." Else assuredly it would not be reprehensible, but the very contrary, in a statesman, that he did not look at the case of the Jews separately, "upon its own merits," but in connexion with the principles of the Constitution, as manifested and developt in its history. Indeed I know not how any statesman, how any man capable of thinking, can look at such a matter separately, "upon its own merits." At all events he who tries to do so is sure to flounder. Even Mr Gladstone himself does not attempt it, but considers the question with reference to certain general principles, which he conceives to be those of the English Constitution in the year 1847, having in that year come to the conviction that it will be for the good of the Constitution to vaccinate it with Judaism. But, though I am far from maintaining that all the consequences which Dr Arnold drew from his theory are quite legitimate and practically expedient, I think it is plain, that, so far as his theory is enunciated in the passages quoted in the last Note, it is no way peculiar or arbitrary. Some of the illustrations may be peculiar, but not the theory of the Constitution itself, except so far as he discerned clearly, what to others may have been more or less indistinct. For it is the only theory which explains and harmonizes the facts of our Constitution hitherto; and it has been working, though often half unconsciously, in the minds of our statesmen, nay, what is far more, in the mind of the nation, for generations. Various public acts have been grounded upon it: and, even when it has been violated, the violation arose, not from a neglect of the principle, but from a

mistake about its application. Moreover the passage quoted from Dorner in Note N,—and I might cite many from other German writers to a like effect,—shews that this same conception of the Christian State has been entertained, not solely by speculative thinkers, but by practical statesmen for centuries, and that it received a legislative enactment, primarily at the peace of Westphalia, and latterly in the Federal Act of the German Confederation in 1815.

In fact, as portrait-painters are apt to introduce touches of their own features and characteristic expression into their representations of others, so Mr Gladstone's account of Dr Arnold's theory is tinged by certain reminiscences of his own. For he too once had a theory, which he workt out elaborately and with much ingenuity, and which might truly be said to be very peculiar and arbitrary. The facts of our Constitution repudiated it: the wheels of the world rolled over it and crusht it: and Mr Gladstone himself, when he took part in public life, and found facts too stubborn to bend to it, was forced to abandon his theory; though at one time he may be said, in his own word, to have "idolized" it, and though it had been "the dream" of his youth "to rear it into actual existence." Thus, having found in his own case that a theory constructed without a due regard to facts will rather hamper than serve a statesman in actual political life, he seems to have contracted a notion that other theories must be like his own, well suited, it may be, for the flowing robe of the philosopher in his study, but a hindrance that must be thrown off by such as gird themselves for the real business of the world. Hence too we find him holding, as it seems, that each case is to be treated separately upon its own merits; a course, which, if followed without reference to general principles, that is, to an intelligent theory of the Constitution, is mere empiricism, and, as such, will grope about for whatever maxims, apparently favorable to its purpose, it can scrape together. Surely it should not require to be asserted nowadays, that in every intellectual operation there is a twofold process, the objective, and the subjective; so that we are to examine each case, both as it is in itself, and

also in its dependence on that portion of the general laws of being which bear immediately upon it; and the right verdict of the judgement will be the reconciliation or identity of the two. In true philosophy, whether politics or whatever else be its subject matter, experience and theory coincide. Empiricism on the other hand is ever vacillating to and fro, and, feeling its own weakness, tries to prop itself up by the first hypothesis it can lay hand on. That Arnold had lookt at the case practically, as well as theoretically, we see from the warm interest with which he speaks on it. He was not a man to be so much moved in behalf of a speculative crotchet.

Yet this same objection to Dr Arnold's authority,—the weight of which on this point is all the greater, because his opinion seems to run counter to the ordinary current of his mind,—has also been alledged by the Bishop of St David's, along with others, which do not appear to me more cogent. Dr Arnold's opinion, that the Jews are to be regarded as aliens, he says (p. 23), "was evidently formed on the analogy of the Greek and Roman States, rather than on the existing circumstances of this country. In the history of those States he found a class, which seemed to correspond to the condition of the Jews; and thus he was naturally led to adopt the views taken by the ancient writers of the position and relations of that class, and to apply them to the case of the Jews." To me, I confess, my friend here appears to have committed a *hysteron proteron*. Surely, if he had been less ingenious, he would have seen that Dr Arnold's views on the position of the Jews in our country were derived from the actual position which they have ever held here, and which is analogous to their position in the other nations of Europe. In this position Dr Arnold would have retained them, barring what they have had to endure in the way of persecution: and in support of this opinion, as was natural for a man of a historical mind, he adduced a remarkably happy parallel from the institutions of Greece and Rome, which had just been revivified by Niebuhr.

The Bishop further urges, in derogation from Dr Arnold's authority, that his opinions on this question arose from his favorite theory on the identity of Church and State. "And not only (he adds) did

they spring from a theory which few of your Lordships will be inclined to adopt; but they are carried to a length to which you would hardly be prepared to go along with him: for, in his opinion, it would not be inconsistent with justice or humanity, if the Government of this country should think proper to transport all the Jews settled among us,—as was done with the Moriscoes in Spain,—to some other region." On the subject of Dr Arnold's theory I need not say more: but with reference to the last objection I feel bound to rejoin, that he is merely putting a hypothetical case, as may be seen in the concluding extracts in Note P. "If we had brought the Jews here by violence, and then kept them in an inferior condition,—even then, I think, we might lawfully deal with them on the Liberia system, and remove them to a land where they might live by themselves independent." Again: "Had we brought them here as captives, I should think that we ought to take them back again; and I should think myself bound to subscribe for that purpose." Surely the hypothetical case greatly diminishes, or rather wholly removes the absurdity of the inference, by which my friend would impair Dr Arnold's authority, but which merely betokens his fervid love of justice. So prone are we to see just what we are looking for, that even the clearsighted Historian of Greece is led to turn into a gross absurdity, what is nothing but an expression of strict conscientiousness: and even when printing his Speech, and adding Dr Arnold's words in a note, he did not perceive how he had distorted their meaning.

NOTE R: p. 37.

The Bishop of St David's,—to whom I refer so frequently, not only because he has publisht an authentic report of his Speech, strengthened by Notes, but also because one may feel pretty sure that whatever arguments can be adduced in favour of the Bill, will be made the best of in his pages,—says (p. 35): "The claim of the Jews to admission into the Legislature has never, I believe, been represented as standing on the footing of absolute,

unconditional right, so as to involve, as was emphatically asserted, the principle of Chartism in its highest announcement. Any statements which may seem to go that length, must in fairness be construed with such a qualification as common sense requires, and the argument itself admits." Still, though the argument from right may not have been carried to such an extreme by the advocates of the measure in Parliament,—though none of them went to the length of the revolutionary fanatics in talking about the inherent inalienable, indefeasible rights of man,—yet the argument from right is sure to have such weight whenever it can be urged, that few advocates will refrain from straining it beyond its proper limits. Hence it was needful that the opponents of the measure should shew how slightly this argument bore upon the question; more especially at a time when all the dykes and embankments by which social order is preserved, have been burst, and visionary rights, which are little else than practical wrongs, are flooding and swamping the face of Europe. For, though natural rights, civil rights, and political rights, rest on very different grounds, and have a very different validity, yet, inasmuch as they are all ranged under the name of Rights, the sanctity and universality, which belong to the first class, are often extended to the others. This confusion is pointed out by Burke in his Speech on the Petition for Relief from Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. "When gentlemen complain of the subscription as matter of grievance, the complaint arises from confounding private judgement, whose rights are anterior to Law, and the qualifications which the law creates for its own magistracies, whether civil or religious. To take away from men their lives, their liberty, or their property, those things for the protection of which society was introduced, is great hardship and intolerable tyranny: but to annex any condition you please to benefits artificially created is the most just, natural, and proper thing in the world. When *de novo* you form an arbitrary benefit, an advantage, preeminence or emolument, not by nature, but institution, you order and modify it with all the power of a Creator over his creature. Such benefits of institution are royalty,

nobility, priesthood; all of which you may limit to birth: you might prescribe even shape and stature."

The exaggeration of expression,—for it does not affect the immediate argument in these words,—is no more than what is to be expected from an orator, who does not profess to treat abstract questions with philosophical precision: but that which may be wanting in this respect, is richly supplied by the excellent observations on the same topic in the *Reflexions on the French Revolution*. "As to the share of power, authority, and direction (Burke there says), which each individual ought to have in the management of the State, that I must deny to be amongst the direct, original rights of Man in civil society.—It is a thing to be settled by convention. If civil society be the offspring of convention, that convention must be its law. That convention must limit and modify all the descriptions of constitution which are formed under it. Every sort of legislative, judicial, or executory power are its creatures. They can have no being in any other state of things." So dangerous is misty vagueness and ambiguity attacht to such a word as Right, whereby the passionate feelings excited by a violation of it under one sense, take fire at a supposed violation of it under another sense, that Burke's disentanglement of this knot was a great benefit, not merely to political philosophy, but to practical politics.

When we take this correct view of the nature of political rights, I cannot see what there is inappropriate in the analogies, by which the denial of these rights, or rather privileges, to the Jews has been vindicated. The Bishop of St David's says, "that the fallacy of the comparison,—with the case of clergymen, of females, of minors, and of persons wanting the pecuniary qualification at present required by the law,—is so glaring, as to be characteristic of the spirit in which the question has been discust." This glaring fallacy, I confess, I cannot perceive. As a reply to an argument maintaining that the Jews, as native English subjects, have a claim of right to be admitted into Parliament, it is perfectly valid to urge that there are other large classes, who

are also excluded. The force of this argument rests solely on the fact of their exclusion, and is a complete logical refutation of that against which it is brought. What the grounds of the exclusion may be in each case, and whether they are all equally valid, is a different question. But it is of importance to simplify the discussion by getting rid of the other plea, so that it may turn wholly on the political expediency of the measure. For a question of expediency it is, like every other political question, of expediency on the highest grounds, in which the moral interests of the nation are to be taken into account, quite as much as its economical prosperity. This is implied in the denial of its being a question of abstract right. Moreover the political condition of the Clergy shews that it is not incompatible with the principles of our Constitution for a class of persons to be entrusted with the elective franchise, and yet to be themselves ineligible. Here again there is a clear analogy. We do not say that the two cases rest on the same grounds. The limited franchise may be expedient in the one case, inexpedient in the other. But we bar the argument that there is any thing unconstitutional, or any inherent inconsistency, in such a distinction.

Hence it appears that the saying of Lord Bacon, which Sir Robert Peel quoted in refutation of Dr Arnold's comparison between the condition of the Jews and the imperfect franchise at Rome, requires certain limitations. Speaking of a natural born English subject, in the argument on the Scotch *Postnati*, Bacon says, that "he is complete and entire. For in the law of England there is *nil ultra;*——and therein it seemeth to me that the wisdom of the law is to be admired both ways, both because it distinguisheth so far, and because it doth not distinguish further. For I know that other laws do admit more curious distinction of this privilege; for the Romans had, besides *jus civitatis*, which answereth to naturalization, *jus suffragii*. For although a man were naturalized to take lands and inheritance, yet he was not enabled to have a voice at passing of laws, or at election of officers. And yet further they have *jus petitionis*, or *jus honorum*. For, though a man had voice, yet he was not

capable of honour and office. But these be the devices commonly of popular or free estates, which are jealous whom they take into their number, and are unfit for monarchies. But by the law of England the subject that is natural born, hath a capacity or ability to all benefits whatsoever; I say capacity or ability: but to reduce *potentiam in actum* is another case."

Had there been any Jews in England in Bacon's time, he could not have written thus. But the old colony was expelled under Edward I.; and the later one only came in under Cromwell. Allowance too is to be made for Bacon's speaking as an advocate, and, as such, extolling that provision of the laws on which his clients grounded their claim. An advocate does not weigh his expressions in a jeweller's scales. For one may certainly question with Arnold whether superior wisdom is indicated by the absence of any qualification, except such as results from property, whereby the Englishman's potential franchise becomes actual. How much too is the force of Bacon's authority on this question diminisht by his admission, that the distinction of franchise belongs to popular or free estates, though he thinks it unfit for monarchies! For an absolute monarch may exercise his own discretion in the choice of his servants: and the more absolute he is, the more he will wish to see them all set on the same level. But when the persons elected by the people are to be the real government of the nation, all care should be taken to secure the judicious exercise of the elective franchise. Now so great changes have been wrought in the English Constitution since Bacon's days, that, what might then be rightly termed a monarchy, would now rather come under the head of "popular or free estates." Thus, while his authority with regard to the historical bearings of the question is of no importance, because he did not contemplate the case, and, if he had, must have written differently, as to its political aspect he may be conceived, if anything, to favour the scheme of having distinct franchises in a Commonwealth like ours.

Nor, on the other hand, is there the slightest worth in the argument that the rights of the citizens of London were violated by

the rejection of the person whom they had returned as their representative to Parliament. The citizens of London, like other people, have no absolute political rights, none but what are measured by their correlative duties. The right of election in all cases is restricted to those whom the Constitution pronounces to be eligible. Had they elected a minor, or a clergyman, the election would be invalid *ipso facto;* and it would hardly have been contended that their rights were infringed by the disallowance of their choice. Even in France the election of Georges Sand would not be accepted as valid. It is true, the election of O'Connell was the immediate occasion of the admission of Romanists into the Legislature. But surely this was not a precedent to be copied. It is a sufficient disgrace to our Legislature, to have been reduced then to yield, under compulsion of outward force, what they had so long refused to concede on the plainest grounds of political expediency. So important a portion of the nation as the Romanists, had every equitable claim to be represented in our Legislature: but I cannot see that the Jews have any, except what they derive from the power of Mammon. In fact the recent case is much more like a parody of that precedent, than a parallel.

NOTE S: p. 38.

This truth, which was the principle of the political institutions of the middle ages, has been brought out into speculative distinctness by the recent philosophy of Germany. Thus Marheineke, in his recently publisht Lectures on Theological Ethics, says (p. 530): "In the philosophy of Christian morals, the State can only be contemplated as it exists in the Christian Church, and consequently as the Christian State. Christianity did not produce the State: it found the State already existing, but first brought out its true idea and purpose. It is the same thing therefore, whether we speak of the true State, or of the Christian State. The Church and State bear the same relation to each other which our feelings do to their manifestation or realization. As this points to their having a common principle, so does it to the

difference between them. The State, like the Family, and the Church, is a moral institution.—In addition to the province of police, and of law, that of morals also belongs to the State, inasmuch as they can only manifest themselves openly therein.—The State cannot produce art, science, or religion: it can only foster them, or, if it will not have them, suppress them. All their expressions, whatever they do, must be in the State: it founds and supports institutions for them: it takes cognisance of them and watches over them.—The moral principle of the modern State is that of Christianity, in that it necessarily implies a recognition of the infinite value of every human being.—The unity of the Church and State is not an external relation, a hypothetical adjunct: they are essentially connected; and this their necessary inward connexion is their unity. They among whom no trace of piety or religious worship should be found, could hardly be a people, but merely wild hordes, just raised above brutes: that any State in the world however should exist without religion is impossible. It is by the Christian Religion, that the noblest feelings of nations, the moral institutions of States, the love of our family and of our country, public spirit and the desire of being useful, and the oaths which unite the people and their soverein, are sanctified; and it is the piety inherent in the State that recognises these ties and obligations.—Our moral life seeks to realize itself in the State, and organizes it into a structure, in which alone can any attain to full freedom of existence and consciousness. The Kingdom of God includes these two provinces, the State and the Church, within it; and thus the State is become an essential part in the Divine Economy. Therefore he who admires the wisdom of God in Nature, ought to admire the wisdom of God far more in the State; seeing that the State surpasses Nature, which lies under unconsciousness and necessity, in the same proportion as she is surpast by the mind, which has wrought out its own world of reason and freedom in history. The last, deepest foundation-stone, on which the edifice of the State rests, is religion. The free spirit of truth is not satisfied with merely acting according to the letter of the laws. The true moral principles

of action lie in the spirit of religion, in the sanctuary of the conscience, in our feelings: and these are cultivated by Religion, in which our highest moral obligations find their primary source. —The Protestant Church cannot give in to the errour of the Romish, according to which the State in itself is a worldly, profane, unholy thing, hereby contrasted with the sacred, divine institution of the Church. Law and Justice, Truth and Morality, the main pillars of the State, are not unholy, profane things. Even when Christianity came into the world, the world was not altogether unholy, but was regulated on all sides by right and law, by order and morality, which Christ Himself and His Apostles declared to be divine institutions."

With reference to the Jewish Question, by which Germany has long been agitated, from having such a number of Jews mixt up with her population, Marheineke, writing previously to the recent changes, says (p. 565): "Only to the Jews, and to the various Christian Sects, as such, the State has no determinate relation. That is, they are merely tolerated: and this implies that their existence in a separate faith and community is an inevitable evil: the State might be what it is without them. As subjects and citizens on the other hand, the sectarians stand on the same footing with all others.—It is an event of great importance that the Christain State has granted civil rights even to the Jews, who, while they belong to the same civil society, belong also to another people and faith. In comparison with the previous cruel oppression and persecution of the Jews, this is a great advance, whereby the human personality even of a Jew is treated with respect. The further question will be, whether it is possible for the Jew to continue standing at this point, or whether the living according to Christian laws and manners will not of itself be the surest, if not the speediest, mode of converting the Jews. This consummation would be a full justification of the wisdom of the State." His view, like that of almost all the wisest men in Germany, was that the most desirable plan would be to give the Jews common civil rights, but to restrict the higher political rights to Christians; and he would have held, with them, that

the opening of the latter to the Jews would be a breach in the Christian character of the State.

Note T: p. 39.

That an irreligious, anti-religious spirit was dismally prevalent in France more than half a century ago, is notorious, and that it was not merely confined to the higher and more cultivated classes, but had spread through the whole mass of the nation. So is it that this spirit had produced its natural effects in demoralizing the people. Efforts have indeed been made for the revival of Religion, both among the Roman Catholics, and by the Protestants; and doubtless, when made in a right spirit, they have borne fruit. Much however that has been done in this way has been too exclusively intellectual, dealing with Christianity as a matter of philosophical speculation, or as the principle of beauty in poetry and the arts. Such views of Religion have little power even over those who hold them; while they leave the body of the people gaping and gasping in the wilderness. On the other hand the intellect in France has been continually spawning with the worst abominations, which seem to have exercised a far more extensive influence. Indeed there is reason to fear that the French have little claim in these days to be called a Christian nation: and hence it would have been a mockery to make the profession of Christianity an indispensable condition for a seat in their Legislature.

With regard to Germany, the religious condition of the people was less generally known; wherefore the atrocious outrages which have been committed there, have excited more surprise and horrour. Thus much indeed was sufficiently manifest, that various modes of Rationalism and Intellectualism had eaten away the very heart of Christianity in a large portion of those who uttered their thoughts in writing, whether treating of questions directly pertaining to theology, or in any other department of literature. But how far the poison had spread, beyond the precincts of the lecture-room and the literary saloon, how far the mind and heart

of the nation had been infected by it, we in this country had less means of judging; except that it was natural to conclude that what had so long been gathering and spreading among the upper classes, must also have reacht the lower. Of this I found a sad confirmation in Tholuck's Dialogues, publisht in 1846, where he says (p. 27): "It has recently been asserted, that, if the real body of the nation were to speak out, and did not lose their courage in the presence of the clamourers, the witnesses in behalf of our ancient faith would, even in our days, be far the most numerous. Now this I cannot venture to maintain. Our townspeople or tradesmen are undoubtedly a large part of the body of the nation: but among them the honest plan followed by the rationalist ministers since the year 1770,—of not attacking, but merely suppressing, all positive Christian doctrine, of not arguing against it, but merely misrepresenting it,—has produced the best fruits: for the ignorance of Christianity among the laity cannot be more enormous than it is. If such light chaff is borne along by the wind of the spirit of the age, there is nothing to surprise us. Rather, when one takes into account by what terrific representations of priestly domination the people has been deceived, how our political opposition urges and drives on the religious, how delusively that watchword of many meanings, Freedom, sounds, and lastly what an ally unbelief has everywhere in the human heart, would it be a matter of surprise if the preaching of faith met with much general acceptation?" From the same eminent divine I heard with deep regret two years ago,—in reply to a question whether he had observed any important change in the religious condition of his University during the many years he had been a teacher in it,—that, though a very great improvement had taken place in the students of theology, so that a number of candidates for orders were sent out every year animated with true Christian zeal and piety, the laity nevertheless seemed to become more and more alienated from Christianity, and the churches were emptier and emptier.

In such a state of things, when a representative government was introduced, it would have been a monstrous anomaly to insist

that the representatives should make a profession of Christianity. It was on the Jewish Question, as we saw in the passage quoted from Dorner (p. 96), that this point was first tried, which gives us a direct personal interest in the matter. Last year, in the Prussian Diet, the higher political privileges were withheld from the Jews. But on the 21st of March this year the Prussian Government proclaimed the complete equality of all religious Confessions; and the same principle, or rejection of all principle, has since been laid down by the Diet at Frankfort. Hence it concerns us to observe how this immense revolution is regarded by the most sagacious minds in Germany; and with this view I will insert another extract from Dorner.

"What every one without distinction, when he surveys the events which have happened in their connexion, must recognise as a necessity forced upon us by the course of history, and which under the premisses could not be averted, is acknowledged by the Christian to be a Divine ordinance, a Divine judgement: and it is the strength of the Church to look these things in the face. For she knows that for her there are no deadly, but only life-giving judgements. That falsehood in our relations, which so much encouraged sloth and hypocrisy in individuals, and a mechanical formalism in the State, now, having been judged, points the eyes of the Church, both the Protestant and the Roman Catholic, to a sin. Neither of the two has to reproach the other; but each has to reproach itself: and she who does this the most honestly, will indicate the healthiest power of life for the future. The candlestick of the Church has not yet been overthrown; but it has been lowered: it has been taken down from its high position, from which hitherto it gave light to all in the house, even in the house of the State. Christianity has been told that people no longer need its light, that the State hopes to get on quite as well with other lights, and will be guided according to circumstances by their illumination. To speak plainly, it has been conceded, if not to downright irreligion, yet to the principles of other religions which stand in hostile opposition to the Christian, that they may bear part

in legislating for and governing the German nation, in the same manner in which the Christian principle has done hitherto. That this should have happened, nay, that it should be relatively an advantage, points to a great sin on the part of the Christian Church. The day is come, when living fruits were sought upon her tree, the fruits *for the healing of the nations*. But we, trusting in security and spiritual sloth to the Christianizing power of infant baptism or of holy water, relying on all manner of spiritual traditions, on the moral and religious influence of decayed institutions, or, it may be, on the cunning fictions of an inexhaustible ingenuity, we have neglected to cherish the gift of the free creative Spirit of God in ourselves, and to seek the lost, to gather the scattered, in self-sacrificing love. When I speak of this as a sin of Christians, I mean not thereby to acquit the world, as estranged from the Church, of sin. But I feel no vocation in me to accuse the world. It did what it could not help doing: for it is swayed by the law, not of freedom, but of necessity. Besides, it knew not what it did. We on the contrary knew what we ought to do, and yet did it not. Therefore is the time come, when, according to St Peter (1. iv. 17), *Judgement must begin at the house of God*. He adds indeed, *If it first begin at us, what shall the end be of those who obey not the gospel of God*. If the Church however puts forth fresh leaves in her state of humiliation, stripping off the dead in the spirit of repentance, and enlivening the old and dry by a new divine power, drawing back from that entanglement with the world, which has surpast her strength, into a life of contemplation, ere long, I hope, the world too would be less withered: nay, much that is now dried up, would be snatcht as a brand from the fire. The nearest coming judgement on the godless, selfish, irreligious world would be the shaking and overthrow of that, which it too regards as an advantage, the foundations of all human order. Only let the House of God, now that judgement begins at it, be led to repentance. If the Church be, as it were, baptized and hallowed anew with the fire of the Holy Spirit, consuming whatever is impure in her, she will again prove herself to be that salt of the

world, which resists its corruption and total dissolution. In the world too will the power of order and of government be strengthened afresh by a revived esteem for the law, and by the public spirit of true patriotism, which seeks, not to rule, but to serve. And then that judgement will spare the world, in proportion as the world opens its heart to a new and deeper reception of Christianity. Therefore I will not accuse the world, which cannot help itself. Rather do I wish that Christians may not be able to deliver their conscience from the feeling of punishment, from the feeling that God has in these days been hiding Himself from them, until, being impelled to search into their sins and their negligences, they find a fresh source of new courage and new strength in God. Instead of unprofitable complaints about what we have lost, instead of straining our faculties to reestablish what is tumbling in ruins, may we be brought to recognise that the chasm between our legal ordinances and institutions, and the spirit which prevails in the people, was actually existing,—that the German people, as a whole, does not pay homage to the principles of Christianity, and therefore that the hollow semblance ought not to be retained. That semblance has fallen away before God's judgement. The truth has come to light. If we recognise the real state of affairs, without giving ourselves up to fictions, either of optimism or pessimism, the truth, sad as it is, may be salutary.—

"It is true, the State has not yet proclaimed itself atheistic. It is true, our new federal code might without falsehood adopt this paragraph: *the majority of Germans profess Christianity.* But can we expect this? Nay can we even wish it? As a piece of statistical information, it would be idle and perplexing; as a similar proposition was in the late French Charter. As a legal statement, it is already precluded by the recent legislation in many of our particular States, and even of the National Diet. The absolute equality of political rights, without regard to any religious Confession, will probably be taken under the protection of our new Federal Constitution.* Then will Atheism itself be politically legitimatized in the new German Empire, and will

* Dorner was writing at the beginning of April.

enjoy all the same rights with faith in God and in Christianity. Much is now said about oaths to the Constitution: but the new German State will not merely refrain from imposing an oath upon Memnonites, but also upon those who could not swear without hypocrisy, since they do not believe in God. Or shall we retain oaths at all? Shall we not in this also follow the pattern of the French? However this may be, at best one case is as possible as the other. The Church therefore has to consider whether it can continue on its former understanding with a State, which may perhaps before long be atheistic in principle,—whether she can receive mandates from it with regard to her own concerns, even should they be to her advantage. Moreover everything is not religion that anybody may call so. At least the Christian Church cannot recognise it as such. Supposing then that the State should still require some sort of religious confession, whatever each person chooses, this in the eyes of the Church would not differ essentially from conferring a political legitimacy on downright Atheism. Or will our modern State engage to decide how far Pantheism, for instance, the worship of humanity, or of our own nature, is religion? Therefore, under the new order of things, we shall have to take a politically legitimatized Atheism into the bargain. A professor of actual Atheism may not merely sit in the ranks of our highest legislators and administrators; but, as such, he is just as much entitled as a professor of Christianity, and will have just the same right, to promote the interests of his own opinions, in discharging the duties of his office, for instance, by promoting atheistical institutions, and by oppressing the Christian Church. It may pain many an honest German heart, that the infinite majority who still believe in God, are allowing the infinite minority who do not believe in Him, to force a form of constitution upon them which they regard as godless, and to destroy that form of constitution which they would otherwise deem the best; that is to say,—since at this extreme point the only alternative is between victory and defeat, and an equality of rights is impossible,—that the minority should conquer, and the majority be conquered. Our confused notions of freedom and equality, and the decay of

the sober fear of God amongst us, have reduced us to such a condition, that the majority, although they believe in God, yet shrink, as from a wrong, from maintaining this faith in action, and from using the power of their superior numbers to establish that form of constitution, which is connected with God and with religion, and proceeds from the axiom of the moral necessity of faith in God. Be it therefore the case, that, by the admission of Atheism to full political rights in the ancient holy German Empire, the majority are sacrificed to a spiritually diseased minority, and consequently that this measure is unjust, irrational, and perhaps also of brief duration, yet, at the present moment, that moral personality, with which the Church had to deal in our ancient State, in point of principle no longer exists, but is extinguisht. If it be said that, in point of fact at least, the religious personality of our ancient State is still subsisting partially, and has not entirely waned away,—and if we are reminded of all those modes of action and institutions which the State has hitherto promoted and protected, and which the Church also regarded as part of her establishment,—which the modern State will perhaps still allow to subsist, for the sake of the Christian majority, even, it may be, under the guardianship of the Church; I quite agree that such things are not to be thrown away,—for that there is a blessing in them; and I am far from thinking that the Church ought to abandon her Divine Ideal, and to extend the rent into those regions into which it has not already penetrated. But the consequence from this is merely, that her aim must be henceforward, as hitherto, to awaken a Christian life in the people, not that she can continue in her former union with the State."

This picture of the condition of Germany is gloomy indeed; though it is a consolation to find there are teachers in the German Church, at this moment of her uttermost need, endowed with such clearness of Christian wisdom and faith. It may be contended that the analogy between the condition of Germany and that of England is one of contrast, rather than of similarity. This is true. Through God's mercy, in spite of all our failings, of all our shortcomings, of all our errours and controversies and

animosities, in spite of all our manifold accumulated sins, we are still a Christian people. The heart of the nation is sound. The preachers of infidelity have not been able to corrupt it. In all classes the professors of Christianity are an overwhelming majority; and there has been a great increase, I believe we may say confidently, of real living Christianity in the last thirty years. But what does this prove? If the reason for abandoning the Christian principle of our Legislature, which exists so wofully in Germany, does not exist in England, why are we to abandon it? If we are a Christian people, and if Christianity, while it has been declining elsewhere, has been gaining strength through God's blessing in England, why are we no longer to have a Christian Legislature? Why are we to do that, which the Germans are doing under the compulsion of a dire necessity, but which their wisest men deplore, as the symptom at least of a most disastrous condition, as the breaking of a tie that has endured for a millennium and a half. Is it seemly thus to sweep away that to which antiquity has given such a sanctity, without any call of principle whatsoever, without any pressure of necessity, without any motive of expediency, rather in violation of the ancient principles of the Constitution, and in defiance of manifold expediency, out of what really seems little else than a wanton spirit of dilettante liberalism?

NOTE U: p. 40.

That the admission of Jews into Parliament will unchristianize our Legislature, has been asserted by the opponents of that measure, and strenuously denied by its advocates. Indeed the Bishop of St David's speaks of this argument as a fallacy he is almost ashamed to advert to. "How often (he says, p. 17), has this objection been confuted by the simple observation, that the Legislature, after this measure shall have been past,—will remain Christian, exactly in the same sense, and precisely in the same proportion, as the country itself is Christian!" To me, I confess, this argument, if it had been used by a less subtile reasoner,

would have seemed a palpable fallacy. For surely one of the worst modes of determining the characteristic properties of any aggregate is to sum up the characteristics of what is so variable as the majority of its members. Bacon has said, with his peculiar felicity of illustration: "The inferring a general position from a nude enumeration of particulars, without an instance contradictory, is vicious: nor doth such an induction infer more than a probable conjecture that there is no repugnant principle undiscovered: as if Samuel should have rested in those sons of Jesse who were brought before him in the house, and should not have sought David, who was absent in the field." The Christian character of the English nation does not result solely from the fact that the majority of its members are Christian, but from the manner in which Christianity has ever been an essential principle in all its institutions. As a nation we are Christians, because we have a Christian Government, a Christian Legislature, and because that Government and Legislature have hitherto been bound indissolubly to the faith and Church of Christ. This being the case, the presence of a few thousand Jewish sojourners does not modify the character of the nation. Nor would it destroy that character, even if they were far more numerous; as the character of the Athenian democracy is determined by that of the Athenian Demus, without regard to the *μέτοικοι* and the slaves, though these far outnumbered the citizens. A man with a wooden leg is a man, not because the majority of his limbs are of flesh and bone, but because he has the living principle of humanity in him. In our case too all the members are perfect: the wooden leg is merely an external appendage.

On this point Mr Gladstone seems to me to come nearer the truth, when he says (p. 31): "I can well believe that to many, and I freely allow that to myself, it is painful thus to part with even the title of an exclusive Christianity inscribed upon the portals of the Constitution. Yet (he adds) to qualify this title, as we are now askt to qualify it, to surrender it as a universal and exclusive title, is not to deprive ourselves of such substantial Christianity as we may really now possess. Advantage is not

unfairly taken in debate of a word: but when it is said that we unchristianize the Parliament, while it may be true in name,—and I would not deny it,—I must ask, is it true in substance?" Thereupon, to escape the inference which would be fatal to his cause, he has recourse to the same unsatisfactory argument, that the Christianity of the Legislature is to be determined, like that of the Nation, by that of the majority. Yet on the admission of the Romanists our Parliament ceast to be a Protestant Parliament. How comes it that the admission of the Jews is not to produce a like change?

That the Christian tone of our parliamentary debates must needs be lowered by the admission of Jews, was maintained with cogent force by the Bishop of Oxford in his masterly speech on the second reading of the Bill, a speech by which it is probable that the majority against the Bill was considerably augmented, and which, like his speech at the meeting of the National Society, was an important benefit to our Church. On this head it has been replied, that the entrance of a few solitary Jews could hardly exercise any material influence, and that we are not to suppose that more than half-a-dozen will be returned. To this argument, which compromises its own cause, so far as it rests on the ground that very few are affected by the exclusion, it is a sufficient rejoinder, that, according to the rules of all good breeding, the presence of a single individual, holding a different persuasion, will check the free expression of the sentiments from which he differs. Indeed the presence of one would be a stronger restraint upon a gentleman, than if parties were nearly balanced. But when we take account of the peculiar advantages which the higher class among the Jews possess for rising in the political world, and when we call to mind how these have been exhibited of late by the presence of two Jews, if not, as has been said, three, among the ten members of the Provisional Government in France, while several, I know not how many, have been acting a conspicuous part in the recent politics of Germany, we may doubt whether the number of Jewish members of Parliament would indeed be so very insignificant.

Moreover there is a further important consideration. It has been said, that the declaration by which religious Jews are excluded from Parliament, has not availed to exclude avowed infidels, such as Gibbon and Bolingbroke. Now of course no declaration can exclude those who do not scruple to lie in making it. But is that a reason for rejecting all such declarations? Is it a reason for rejecting the use of words, and the confidence in them, that some people follow Talleyrand's maxim of using them to conceal their thoughts? At all events the declaration is so far effectual, that, if an unbeliever were to enter Parliament now, he would be incapable of avowing his infidelity. Every member of the Legislature is bound by his declaration to promote the interests of Christianity, or, at the very least, to refrain from injuring it, either in deed or in word. Should any be shameless enough to do so, the outcry which would be provoked, could not now be represt by a protest that *We are not Christians here.* But if this restraint, which the principles of our Constitution impose upon covert infidelity, were removed,—and, when Jews are admitted, I see not how any form of enmity to Christianity could long be excluded from our Legislature, any more than from the French and German,—it may be that some, which may now be latent, would find vent. How much there may be, I have no means of judging. In former periods of our history, we know, there has been much. Possibly there may be less at present. If so, let us be thankful. But at all events let us abstain from creating any encouragement, or any facilities, for its utterance or its increase.

Some people indeed, taking up the slang of the day, may object, that the cause of truth and honesty can only be promoted by our getting rid of every kind of sham, and therefore that, if there be any latent unbelief in our Parliament, it ought to be uttered boldly and unhesitatingly. But what should we say to the Board of Health, if they were to order all the cesspools in the country to be uncovered, lest we should affect to be cleaner than we are? This whole mode of thought is utterly fallacious, from not duly recognising the great struggle in our nature,

the constant presence of evil, which good at the utmost can only suppress, never wholly expell. Are laws useless, because they cannot eradicate the seeds of evil, but only repress their grosser manifestations? Are manners useless, because they can only restrain the vicious from exposing their grosser vices in the sight of day? O, we need every check, every help, for our frail, tottering virtue: and all are too few. We all need them individually; and we need them no less nationally. Nor are they falsehoods, or shams, but rather props and pillars of truth, which keep us from falling headlong into the snares of the Father of lies. We are not made to walk naked in heart and mind, any more than in body; and if we did, we should be falser than we are. Αἰδὼς has ever been a chief support of Truth, as of every other virtue.

NOTE V: p. 47.

Thus Horsley, in some interesting Letters on the prophecies concerning Antichrist, which were publisht in *the British Magazine* for 1834, says (p. 135): "I confess, I am not so well satisfied as you seem to be with that interpretation of Rev. vi. 12—17, which finds the accomplishment of that vision in the suppression of idolatry by the Christian Emperors. I think it cannot be understood of anything less than the final overthrow of Antichrist by our Lord at His coming. I admit, that darkness in the sun and moon, and a falling of the stars, are images in frequent use among the prophets, to denote the overthrow of empires, or the fall of mighty potentates. But in this passage of the Revelation these images are amplified to the utmost."

NOTE W: p. 50.

A fashion has grown up of late, to apologize for, and even to extoll, the former French Revolution, on account of the benefits, such as those mentioned in the text, which have resulted from it. But this is much as if a person were to fall in love with

a hurricane, because it purifies the air, without taking count of the desolation which it spreads around. Doubtless a pestilence too, in the order of Providence, has its purificatory power. In this manner the judgement of History will often reverse the judgement of contemporaries. Yet they are not inconsistent: only contemporaries look at the agents, at their motives and characters; History looks rather at the acts, and their consequences. Though man must not do evil that good may come, History recognises that good does come out of evil. This however does not justify the evil, or the evil-doer.

NOTE X: p. 54.

The *Democratie Pacifique* for the 9th of last April opens with an article entitled *La Pâque de la France*, which is a truly awful example of the extravagances of the modern revolutionary pantheistic fanaticism. It turns upon the appointment of Easter Sunday as the day on which the members of the National Assembly were to be elected.

"Par une remarquable coincidence le jour où la nation française doit exercer cette pleine souveraineté dont elle a été privée si longtemps, c'est le jour de Pâque, le jour où le Christ est ressuscité d'entre les morts. La France va faire ses pâques; elle va communier dans une grande pensée de régénération; elle va célébrer le jour de la résurrection du Sauveur en rentrant en possession d'elle-même, en manifestant sa volonté souveraine. Pour les Juifs, Pâque était la délivrance, l'affranchissement du joug des Pharaons; pour les Chrétiens, Pâque était la résurrection, la victoire remportée sur la mort par l'Homme-dieu; pour la France en 1848, Pâque doit être la glorification définitive du Christ, du peuple, de l'humanité. Quand Jésus fut ressuscité, il ne vécut que quarante jours sur la terre; il n'y vécut que d'une vie incomplète, isolée, mystérieuse; car la terre était encore une vallée de larmes; la terre était soumise à la domination de César, de César qui avait crucifié Jésus. Le règne du Christ n'était pas encore de ce monde, et la résurrection elle-même

n'avait pu triompher de Satan et de César. La Pâque chrétienne n'était donc qu'un symbole, une figure, une promesse de la résurrection définitive. Ressuscité d'entre les morts, le Christ ne pouvait habiter d'autre séjour que les cieux, domaine de l'infini. Il s'y élança, le quarantième jour après sa résurrection ; et, dix jours après, il envoya le Saint Esprit à ses apôtres. Mais il leur promit de revenir sur la terre, dans toute sa puissance et sa gloire. Eh bien ! malgré des efforts inouis le Christ n'a pu encore revenir sur la terre ; il n'a pu ressusciter glorieux dans l'humanité ; il est toujours sur la croix où l'a attaché César, il y a dix huit siècles ; et le peuple, qui est l'image vivante du Christ, porte toujours sa croix d'indigence et de servitude.——O France très chrétienne ! cette promesse ne serait-elle donc qu'une déception ? Et si elle est une vérité, le moment n'est-il pas enfin venu de l'accomplir ? O France très chrétienne ! n'est ce pas toi surtout qui a mission de ressusciter le Christ glorieux dans l'humanité ? N'est ce pas toi qui a été choisie entre toutes les nations pour détacher le peuple de sa croix séculaire, pour inaugurer la pâque définitive du genre humain, pour donner à la fois le précepte et l'exemple de la fraternité ? Non, non, la France ne sera point infidèle à cette grande et sainte mission ; elle saura l'accomplir en révolutionnant, comme en organisant, en détruisant, comme en édifiant ; elle saura trouver dans son âme des trésors de génie et d'amour, pour pratiquer et faire pratiquer au monde la fraternité universelle. Par la force de sa volonté souveraine la France fera descendre le Christ des cieux sur la terre. Après quatorze siècles de batailles et de révolutions, la France a désormais vaincu César ; elle a proclamé la République chrétienne, et préparé le retour glorieux du Fils de l'Homme. Oui, ce retour glorieux du Christ, cette résurrection définitive de l'Homme-Dieu, nous y touchons. Qui pourrait en douter ? Les signes des temps ne se manifestent-ils pas de toutes parts ? Le genre humain tressaille d'espoir à l'idée que la crucification va finir, que la glorification va commencer. A cette heure même combien de peuples ne donnent-ils pas leur sang pour cette idée ? derniers martyrs de la promesse divine ! Eh quoi ! la France ne

vient-elle pas aussi de donner son sang, et n'éprouve-t-elle pas un frisson prophétique, en agitant encore la bannière où elle inscrivit cette trinité sainte: *Liberté, égalité, fraternité?* Et ce nouveau cri qu'elle fait entendre: *Organisation du travail!* n'est-il pas comme la voix de l'ange annonçant au monde la *Résurrection définitive du Christ?* Oui, voici le jour de la résurrection! Voici la pâque de la France, qui sera aussi la pâque de l'humanité! Oui, en l'an de grâce 1848, il n'est pas un bon républicain, qui ne doive faire ses pâques, en votant pour la réalisation de cette devise chrétienne: Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité! Français! Venez, venez tous communier dans une même pensée de régénération sociale; votez tous pour l'association intégrale et universelle, pour l'organisation de la vie nouvelle dans la commune, dans la nation, dans l'humanité; élisez ceux qui savent, qui veulent, et qui peuvent mener à bien cette grande œuvre de charité, d'égalité, et de fraternité, et vous ressusciterez le Christ glorieux! Venez donc à cette communion sainte, dans laquelle vous créerez et recevrez en même temps le pain de vie, et par laquelle vous rendrez à jamais le Christ vivant en vous et dans le monde! Approchez-vous de l'urne du scrutin, pleins de confiance dans les destinées de la France, et de l'humanité; approchez-vouz de cette sainte table où vous recevrez et donnerez la divine eucharistie, où, en conférant le pouvoir à ceux qui ont déjà le savoir, vous puiserez vous-mêmes en eux une force nouvelle!"

I have not transcribed this mass of wild and profane nonsense for the sake of the disgust which it must needs excite in every soberminded English Christian, but because it is desirable that the Church should know what enemies she has to combat with. For the sentiments here exprest are not the ravings of a solitary madman. In one form or other they are diffused, I am afraid, far and wide, and are exercising no slight influence; and there are men, who would otherwise shrink from crime, yet who would not be slow to commit it for the sake of realizing their extravagant visions. The very fact, that Easter Sunday was appointed for the election of the National Assembly, had itself a national significance; and various indications shewed that this significance was

connected in the minds of many with delusions approximating, more or less, to those exprest in the *Democratie Pacifique.*

The pantheistic view has ever been apt to regard our Lord as a type of humanity, both in His nature, and in His history: and doubtless there is a portion of important truth mixt up with this errour, the truth which is exprest scripturally by the union between Christ and the Church. Moreover, as ever happens, when numbers of people, who are not lying to their own hearts, are carried away by any delusion, there is also an important political truth conveyed, however vaguely and distortedly, in the extravagant language we have been quoting; a truth which it would seem to be the special calling of our age to bring forward in its power and majesty. They who talk in this manner about Christianity, are persuaded that Christianity has something to do, not merely with our individual hearts and consciences, with our domestic relations, and our duties to our immediate neighbours, but also with the political life of nations, with our widest social relations, with our agriculture, our commerce, our trade, with our courts of justice, our Parliament, the councils of our Kings, with all the functions of Government. Their views on these subjects are very dim, very confused; but they feel that they have got hold of a truth here, and that this truth has never yet been duly recognised, explicitly and in act, though in principle it has ever been implied by the union of the modern State with Christianity. Still, they feel, it has never exercised more than a small portion of that mighty healing power, which it ought to exercise on all the political and social relations of mankind. They feel that, in this great region of life, the purpose of Christ's coming has never yet been accomplisht. And who will dare to say that it has? Even if the saving and healing influence of Christianity on the moral and spiritual lives of individual Christians had been a hundredfold deeper and more extensive than it ever has been, surely we should still have to admit that this improvement by itself would not be enough; nay, that there must be something very unsatisfactory and hollow in it, unless it were manifested by a corresponding improvement in our political and social life. Of

course it would be so; and the miserable condition of the latter is an irrefragable proof of the superficialness of the former. Can we wonder then, if there are persons, who, being earnestly desirous of seeing their fellow-creatures happy, when they look round and discern the enormous mass of misery in the world, the abject wretchedness and degradation under which such vast swarms of human beings are continually suffering in Christian countries, in countries which have been lying for eight or ten centuries, or even more, beneath the light of Christianity, are moved to ask, *Was it for this that Christ died? was it for this that He rose again? Is this the fulfilment of the blessings which were to wait upon the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven?*

To such questions we can only return the same answer as the French Socialists, *No.* Surely it behoves us to say to them, *We recognise all these evils quite as much as you do; we deplore them quite as much; we agree with you in thinking that they should not be allowed to continue, and that it is the prime duty of every Christian society to employ its utmost wisdom and energy in taking care that such evils shall not arise within its territories, or that, if they should arise, they shall be removed and extirpated. Besides we hold as firmly as you can do, that it is the proper work of Christianity,—and a work which no other power can effect,—that it is the work of Christian wisdom, and of Christian temperance, and of Christian diligence and perseverance, and of Christian love, to prevent all such evils, to check and abate them, to remove and extirpate them. Only we also see other evils, of which you appear to take little or no count, evils still greater, still more widely diffused, still more terrible and crushing, still more obstinate in resisting every effort to cure them, the sins, the vices, the fraud, the greediness, the blighting selfishness, the reckless self-indulgence, the deadening licentiousness and intemperance, the falsehood, the utter godlessness, which spread witheringly, not through one class of society merely, but through all, which are ever breeding new forms of misery, and which baffle all attempts to relieve them. These are the real causes and sources of all our national, of all our political, of all our social evils. These too, and all the other*

forms of sin, which spring out of our want of faith, out of our estrangement from God, are the evils from which Christ especially came to deliver mankind, by His blessed Passion and Resurrection; and, until mankind rise out of these evils, the work of His Passion, the work of His Resurrection will be incomplete. Moreover it is only by repressing these more terrible fontal evils, that the evils which flow from them can be effectually abated. The work of Governments is indeed mainly to relieve and repress the latter. They have no power of contending against the former. They leave that to Religion, in Christian countries to Christianity, which alone has the real power. But for this very reason no change, which merely affects the form of a Government, can deserve to be glorified with the sacred name of the Resurrection. A change worthy to bear that name must take place in the inner world of man's spiritual nature.

Now this, which is the main point, the all in all, in the Christian view of Christ's work, is almost entirely left out of account in the French speculations concerning it. The authors of them forget sin. They forget that Christ came to deliver us from our sins, from the burthen of our own sins, not merely from the oppression inflicted upon us by those of others. They seem wholly to forget that they themselves, and that all human beings, have a sinful nature, which we have all made far worse by giving way to it and indulging it, and from which we need to be delivered, before we can in any way become partakers in the blessings of Christ's Resurrection. They appear to fancy that the only evils of much importance in the world, are those which are caused by the vices of kings and their ministers, and that if these are removed by the destruction of the authorities which have bred them, the whole world will become brimfull of happiness in a trice,—Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity will dance over the earth,—and all nations will be swallowed up in a deluge of Love. The childish visionariness of the notions broacht by men, who might otherwise be deemed intelligent, is quite portentous. All the lessons taught by the history of the world,—all the lessons written in characters of fire and blood by the events of their own former Revolution,—

all the lessons which every man ought to learn by looking into his own heart,—are thrown overboard, as a ship will throw its cargo overboard, when a hurricane is sweeping it along. No wonder then that the deep and momentous truths, which are imprest upon us by the ordinance that the long penitential season of Lent should come before the joyous Resurrection of Easter, are wholly lost sight of by this newfangled religious sentimentalism. These French mockers and perverters of Christian truth fancy that they shall rise again, that they shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, without repentance, or so much as a thought of it. They fancy that they shall become sharers in the blessedness of Christ's Resurrection, without entering in any way into the communion of His sufferings. But these things cannot be. They tell us that they shall bring Christ down by the soverein will of the people to reign upon earth. Just as reasonably might they talk of dragging down the sun from the sky, to serve them instead of fires, by the soverein will of the people. In fact this is their main delusion,—this is the idol they worship,—the will of man, the will of the people, which everybody, as was seen continually in the former Revolution, and as we have seen daily this year, identifies with his own will.

I do not mean, that political institutions are altogether indifferent, and can produce no effect upon the moral character of the people. Free institutions, as they afford ampler opportunities for the action of certain manly virtues, tend to foster them, in a condition of society where the germs of them are already existing. This however must be a work of time, of years, nay, of successive generations. It cannot manifest itself at once, by a magical change. Universal suffrage is not a Harlequin's wand,—though the French seem almost to regard it as such,—by which a nation of sordid, unprincipled rogues, as they declare themselves to have been under the Government they have expelled, can be transformed into a nation of disinterested, magnanimous heroes. So far from it, that, in its action upon corrupt hearts, it can only supply free scope and licence for the exhibition of their corruption; just as the enfranchisement of slaves, who have not been

previously prepared for freedom, is much like the letting loose of wild beasts, and sets all their vices running riot.

The thoughts thus called up constrain us to remember that a twofold Resurrection is spoken of, not only a Resurrection to life, but also a Resurrection to condemnation. Nor can we forget that, when the former Revolution broke out, then also, as at the first outbreak of the present,

> A golden palace rose, or seemed to rise,
> The appointed seat of equitable Law,
> And mild paternal sway.—Prophetic harps
> In every grove were ringing, *War shall cease.*
> *Did ye not hear that conquest is abjured?*
> *Bring garlands, bring forth choicest flowers to deck*
> *The Tree of Liberty.* . . . .
> *Be joyful, all ye nations, in all lands*
> *Ye that are capable of joy be glad.*
> *Henceforth whate'er is wanting to yourselves,*
> *In others ye shall promptly find, and all*
> *Be rich by mutual and reflected wealth.*

The poet adds, "Scorn and contempt forbid me to proceed." When a poet in some future generation is looking back upon the events of this year, will he not have to speak of the bursting of our bubble in the same bitter language? At all events, as the past must ever be our criterion for judging of the present, when we call to mind that the nation which is enacting this Revolution, is the same which enacted the former, and that, though its character must no doubt have been considerably modified by the events of the last sixty years, yet there are scanty traces of its having gone through that preparatory discipline, which is indispensable for the Resurrection to life, we cannot but feel an awe-stricken foreboding, lest this Revolution also, like the former, should bear much more of the character of the Resurrection to condemnation.

For what is the test whereby we are to judge whether a man, or any body of men,—and this will apply to a nation also,—are partakers of the blessings of Christ's Resurrection? If we are risen with Christ, we must seek those things which are above; we must set our affections on things above, not on things on the

earth. Now is there the slightest indication of anything like this, in the recent acts of the French people, or of their leaders? Even allowing their rulers, their speechmakers, and their writers, to be thoroughly sincere and in earnest, are not the very highest objects, which they even profess to aim at, things on the earth? not even moral excellences, not even those heroic qualities which the legislators and reformers of the ancient world endeavoured to cultivate; but mere physical comforts and indulgences. They do not seem to have a notion of anything beyond. If we take St Paul's next test, that they who are risen with Christ, must mortify their earthly members, fornication, uncleanness, inordinate desires, evil lusts, and covetousness, is there a spot upon earth where the whole people are more remote from all such mortification than at Paris? Do we not know, from every account of French society, from the loathsome exposures in their courts of justice, and from the pestilential effluvia of their literature, that they do not even regard such mortification as desirable, that they do not think of aiming at it, that they rather eschew and scorn it? Nay, has it not been boasted of, as the peculiar glory of the new era, that it will lead to the emancipation of the flesh, that is, to the abolition of every sacred bond by which the licence of the flesh is represt; in other words, to the unrestrained indulgence of every animal passion, of every brutish appetite?

What hope then of anything like a Resurrection can be grounded on such a foundation? There are three steps or stages, along which we must mount, or rather be raised by the Spirit of God, into the fellowship of Christ's Resurrection; and these are markt by the more and more complete subjugation of and deliverance from that sinful nature, the rising out of which is the true idea and purpose of the Resurrection. These three stages are self-controll, self-denial, self-sacrifice. He who has ascended these three steps, which none can mount, save through the help of the Holy Spirit,—he who is enabled to live in the exercise of these three powers over himself, not occasionally and by fits and starts, but habitually,—is risen out of his carnal nature; and this world of death has no dominion over him. Miserably few however and poor are the tokens of these spirits

perceivable in the revolutionary proceedings of the French, while the opposite vices are rank and rampant. But, without these three Christian graces, there can be no national renewal, or regeneration, or Resurrection. Without these, we must still continue under the bondage of self, under the yoke of our will, of our own passions, children of Death, and not children of the Resurrection. Without these, there can be nothing more than a caricature of those blessed heavenly realities, such as Satan is fond of enacting at times, when, to gain his own purposes more securely and completely, he puts on the form of an angel of light. But this delusive phantom lasts only for a while: when it is most showy, the hoof may be discerned by those who have eyes to look for it; and ere long the whole monster is disclosed in all his hideous deformity.

There is indeed, as I have acknowledged, a germ of truth hidden in this bloated French delusion, namely, that Christianity has never yet exercised the power which she ought to have exercised, —and which she would have exercised, unless men's vices had continually unnerved her arm, and thwarted and checkt her efforts,— on the political and social condition of mankind. Some blessed fruits have indeed sprung from her influence, among which I will only mention one of the most blessed,—the position which women now hold, especially in Protestant countries, when compared with their position among the Heathens. But even in this, as in all our other social relations, many things are still very defective and wrong, in consequence of our unbelief and hardness of heart, in consequence of our not having made a right use of the blessed privileges which God has placed within our reach, in consequence of our having all sought our own gratification, our own ease, our own pleasure, instead of the glory of God, and the good of our fellow-creatures. This we have all done, high and low, rich and poor, learned and simple, in England, as in all other countries. Hence have these calamities befallen the other nations of Europe. Hence too have we been threatened with somewhat similar calamities; the danger of which we must not suppose to have past away, until their causes are effectually removed. Through God's

mercy we have hitherto been signally preserved; and through that mercy we shall still be preserved, if we give heed to the warnings which we are receiving from all sides. When other nations are boasting of rising again, we should recollect that we also are called to do so, not indeed in the same way, but in a better and surer. That we may fulfill this our high calling, let us not forget or neglect the penitential offices which must precede it. Let us all, high and low, acknowledge all those sins against the great law of Christ, whereby the social and political improvement of our nation has hitherto been so grievously impeded. Let us make the confession continually to ourselves, to each other, to the people, to God, stirring up ourselves and each other and the whole people to cast away those sins, by endeavouring earnestly and diligently to do what we have hitherto left undone. This will be the right preparation for a true political Easter. O let us here in England bear ever in mind,—we are less excusable than other nations if we forget it,—that, without a moral regeneration, there can be no political regeneration. The history of all nations, Heathen as well as Christian, teaches us this. As Christians, we know further, that the only sure and lasting source of a moral regeneration is a spiritual regeneration. A political regeneration without these is a mere phantom, a dream, a mist, a castle in the air, a palace among the clouds, from which anon will issue lightning and thunder. Let us all strive assiduously to attain to these three modes of regeneration. In no case have we ever striven enough; mostly we have shamefully neglected it. But let all classes beware of being led astray by the notion, that we can advance in the course of our political regeneration by acts destructive of our moral and spiritual regeneration, by acts which outrage the Conscience and violate the sanctities of Duty. Such acts can only lead to the Resurrection of condemnation.

NOTE Y: p. 62.

The quotations I have inserted above from Dorner, shew with what feelings the political events of this year are viewed by the

leading minds in the German Protestant Church, as a warning to repent, to set their house in order, and to be more diligent in the discharge of their duties. Ecclesiastically they are regarded as a special call on the Church to frame a constitution for herself and thus to complete the work, which, through the compulsion of outward circumstances, was left unfinisht at the Reformation. In this spirit Kling, one of the most eminent among the younger German divines, says in the Monthly Journal of the Evangelical Church in the Rhenish provinces for the month of June: "We are still in the midst of the movement. The sword of dissension and insurrection is still waving here and there; and opposite interests are engaging in a fierce conflict. We are still threatened on more than one side with a bloody war; and what internal disorders and convulsions this might produce we know not. The new order of things is only beginning to shape itself; and its rudest outlines are lying indistinctly before our eyes. What consequences it may produce with regard to the Church, how our ecclesiastical life will stand in reference to this overthrow of all our social relations, is still very obscure: and we only know thus much, that, come what may, the Lord, to whom all power is given in Heaven and on earth, and who has promist to be with His own, with those who believe in Him and love Him, unto the end of the world,—that He, the Faithful and True, who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, will not leave His promise unfulfilled, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church, which is built on the faithful confession of His name,—that His kingdom shall endure, although the mightiest thrones should fall, and though all order, firmly as it may have seemed to stand, should be subverted.—But we should by no means fulfill our duty as evangelical Christians, if we were merely to look on at the course of affairs, and calmly await what each coming day may bring forth, merely mindful to preserve a Christian temper of mind and to discharge the immediate ordinary duties of our special calling. An extraordinary crisis demands extraordinary activity.—A Christian must not content himself with complaining of revolutionary designs, of the manner in which the people are deceived by

self-seeking, ambitious, vain men. He is bound to exert himself, according to his station, as a free citizen, in all openness and sincerity, be it only by his presence and his vote, and, where he has an opportunity, by an honest and reasonable discussion with his well disposed fellow-citizens, so that such evil-minded enterprises may be brought to shame, and that our free deliberations may produce a good result, or at least the best which under existing circumstances is possible.—Thus, by taking part in public affairs, with that simplicity which includes wisdom, and that wisdom which includes simplicity, he will win confidence; and while he hopes and trusts in the Lord, who rules the hearts of nations as well as of princes, who can bring good out of evil, can perfect that which is defective, and can mould our new frame of things, even though at first it should have a less righteous and godly character, nay, one dangerous and hostile to Christian truth and goodness, for the furtherance of His kingdom,—while he thus hopes for good, and comes forward trustfully, so far as he can and may, to meet those with whom he is brought into contact, in that love which believes all things and hopes all things, he will also be listened to with confidence; and, if he knows how to catch the right moment, his faithful and intelligent testimony in behalf of truth, of religion, and of the essential religious and moral groundwork of all civil and social prosperity, will find acceptance. Thus he will be able to act for that which he regards as the highest of all things, and that too more effectually and widelier, than would otherwise have been possible. A time when everything is loosened and torn up, is a time for sowing: then is the earth unusually receptive for all kinds of seed, good and bad.—Only herein our conduct should be guided by an honorable adherence to the state of things brought about by that Divine Providence, without which nothing takes place; so that we must never even think of forming a party for the restoration of that which has been overthrown and destroyed, but must fix our aim solely on acting for the cause of justice and order and the public good in the new frame of our civil life, on turning whatever possibilities for the bettering of our social relations may lie therein, with all diligence and prudence, into realities, and on doing our utmost

to engraft our new institutions with those religious and moral principles, which are the foundation of all lasting security and of all true prosperity. This however is not to be effected merely by the word of doctrine, of reproof, of exhortation, of admonition, but still more by our conduct, by the spirit of truth and honesty, of love and uprightness, of humility and modesty, of self-denial and affectionate confidence, of seriousness and mildness, manifesting itself in all that we do and leave undone. In proportion as it is thus seen and felt that we are not seeking our own good, but that of others, and of the public, that we are ready, in all disinterestedness, to serve and help every one according to his need and to our ability, and that, while we disapprove and condemn whatever comes from an impure source, and boldly resist violence and evil, we can at the same time bear with weakness, and endeavour to be mild and gentle,—in the same proportion will a word of doctrine and admonition, of warning and reproof, proceeding from us, find reception; and the testimony which we bear to the Gospel by our actions, may also find utterance in words. More especially will it produce a good impression, and one advantageous to the cause of truth, if we take a lively and loving interest in everything which relates to the removal of our present distresses, and of those social mis-relations which are a main source of them; if therefore, with all good faith and unwearied zeal, according to our gifts and our position, we strive with word and deed, in our own circle, that those who are able and desirous to work may obtain that employment which is necessary for the support of themselves and of their families,—and that that unchristian and inhuman state of things, the source of so much discontent, bitterness, and, it may be, of the utter disorganization of our social system, may come to an end, that state of slavery, in which a number of our fellow-Christians and fellow-men are degraded into mere instruments for the enriching of a few, where the many are sacrificing their toil, their health, and their intellectual and moral well-being, to the greediness, the pomp, and luxury of the few; a state of things which, being sinful in itself, must in its turn produce sinful enterprises, and involves an infinite mass of disasters. To bear witness

against this state of things, on every proper occasion, with all caution, that we may not afford an encouragement for wanton tumults, and to strive that love and equity may become prevalent in all these relations, is a holy Christian duty. The fulfilment of it is now facilitated by our having such loud-preaching examples before us, that, *as it was won, so is it gone;* now that the Lord God is proclaiming so irrefragably, by the voice of facts, how perishable all earthly riches are, how that which seemed to stand unshakably will suddenly crumble, how the most enormous wealth may be changed in a moment into poverty and want, how wretched and miserable is he who has no other treasures than this worthless, unrighteous mammon. But, as it is right and our duty to speak out boldly on this side, so does it behove us on the other side.—The more the Evangelical Church, in the midst of this perturbed and needy generation, devotes itself to the welfare of the lower classes, trustingly, hopingly, lovingly, and tries to enter into their wants, the fairer prospects open themselves that Evangelical Christianity will become a power in the present and the future, and that the name of Her Head shall be glorified in this age.—How, in the most difficult circumstances, to which ours will hardly exhibit a parallel, the Evangelical Church, by the faithful, self-sacrificing activity of love, and by a wise adaptation to necessity, without compromise of conscience, may maintain herself, and acquire new power, has been set before us in the bright example of that man of God, Oberlin. This example would retain its force, even if the Evangelical Church were to be stript of all the dignity and influence which it possesses with the Christian State, or had to surrender them voluntarily in consequence of the State's abandoning the principles of Christianity.—If our Church is to act at present with that energy which is absolutely necessary, all appearance of her dependence on the State and the Government, of her being favoured and supported by political power must vanish: she must shew that, without all political aid, she has in herself the power to overcome the world, and thus to glorify the name of her Lord before the whole world. One might doubt and deem it questionable whether the Church ought of herself to take

any step for the abolition of her present relation, if the State continues to call itself and to act as a Christian State. But every scruple vanishes, when the State gives up its Christian character: and this it does, when it renders the enjoyment, not merely of civil, but also of political rights, wholly independent of every religious Confession, hereby declaring that even those who are not Christians, that Jews, nay, avowed atheists, are qualified for magisterial offices and functions, not excepting the highest, so that such a person may even become Minister of Public Worship. Such however is already our condition in several German states, among others in Prussia. Therefore is it necessary that we should hold ourselves ready betimes for a great decisive step, that we should maintain the honour of our Church with all determination, resolved for every sacrifice, however great it may be. We must assemble without delay, and consider the sacred wants of this age on all sides, that, with a clear consciousness of all the difficulties which beset us, and of the great work we have to perform, we may unite to establish the independence of our Church, in the way of order and legality, not with violence and defiance, but, as becomes the Evangelical Church, with all humility, calmness, and modesty, yet, for this very reason, with a firmness which cannot be seduced from its well-weighed resolutions by any earthly interest, by any lure or threat. We in the Rhenish provinces and in Westphalia, who already possess an ecclesiastical Constitution must lead the way, calling however immediately on all our brethren, in every Province of our narrower, and every State of our larger country, to act along with us, and seeking in union with them whether God will not give us His grace, so that a German Evangelical Church may be built up, even as we have begun politically to build up a united German nation. Let us beseech Him to pour out His spirit upon us and our people; and let us use all diligence, that we may accomplish a good work, well-pleasing to Him, not with any reactionary aims, in opposition to our new political constitution, but only desiring from our position, with all love, truth, and devotedness, to help the princes and the people in gaining a permanent form for that which has any positive worth;

so that, in this new order of things, that which is God's may be rendered to God, and Truth and Love may meet together, Righteousness and Peace may kiss each other. Let us proceed to work then in Jesus name. If He is with us, all will turn out well. To Him I commend our cause: it is also His. He is faithful and mighty over all. He will do it, and accomplish it."

These principles and views have not found expression merely in the writings of individuals, but in the proceedings and resolutions of several Conferences held by the leading members of the Church in the Rhenish provinces, lay as well as clerical. Should the Christian wisdom and meekness and faith, which have found utterance in the passages I have quoted from Kling and Dorner,—and I might add others from other writers animated by a kindred spirit,—be allowed to guide these councils, we might look forward with joyful, thankful hope to a time when our sister Church in Germany will rise out of her present humiliation in greater vigour and power than has ever yet been vouchsafed to her. At all events there is much in these extracts, from which we too, even now, may learn our own duty; and if we do so we shall be better prepared for meeting whatever dangers may await us. Moreover we too, if the Christian character of our Legislature is subverted by the admission of Jews, shall have to strive more urgently than we have ever yet done, to gain a properly constituted Ecclesiastical Synod.

"The State (says Dorner,—and his words would in that case apply to us) with which the Church has hitherto been so closely connected, no longer exists: a State of another character has occupied its place. Hence it can no longer be a question whether the Church shall continue in its present relation to the State. The State has already solved the question. By the same act, by which it made religious indifference its central principle, it also discarded the Christian Church from its heart. Discarded by the State as she is, she has no longer the power to regard what has been done as not done. Instead of wasting her strength in such idle fictions, she will descend to the condition of outward humiliation now assigned to her in comparison with her former eminence, but will seek,—and this is her privilege and her strength, and the honour still left

to her,—with God's help to turn this calamity into a blessing. Let her therefore gather her powers together, being set free from all those complexities and entanglements, which her previous relation to the State has caused, not without a perturbation of her inward nature. Let her convert this dismissal by the State into a true freedom before God, in her dependence on her Head, Christ. Let her remember the Apostolical saying, *All things are yours*, and Luther's, *A Christian is a Lord of all things through faith.* But let her not forget, as she has too often done hitherto, the second part of our Reformer's precious Treatise concerning the Freedom of a Christian, that *The Christian is a servant of all things in love;* studying above all to preserve love toward the poor, and to kindle it to a more glowing heat toward those classes, who, through their moral and religious debasement, accusing us as the cause of it, have become the unhappy, involuntary instruments of God's judgement against us. Let her embrace the whole body of the nation, more than she has ever yet done, with her love and care, from that position which has been forced upon her, and for which she has to set herself in order."

NOTE Z: p. 64.

In some of these latter Notes, I have been illustrating the feelings and principles, which ought to regulate our conduct here in England in these times of trial, by shewing what the wisest men in Germany regard as the duty of the Church in a condition of far more terrible trial. I will add two more extracts of the same kind. The first shall be from the Preface to the new Volume of Nitzsches Sermons, where, after stating that he had preacht at Berlin on the morning after the fatal night of the 18th of March before a very small congregation, but that, in doing so, he had rather prayed than preacht, as became such an awful moment, he adds: "The time into which we have been plunged unawares, and which is compelling us, by the most painful strokes from the rod of a great Master and Teacher, to learn the alphabet of all civil and legal order anew, must needs call the preacher also to his work

His outward position may seem changed and periled. The flood of our political life, which has too long been represt, and here and there vainly staved back, and which now is rushing over us all the more vehemently, may soon spread over the Church and our Universities and their constitution. So long however as we have hearers,—and our Churches will rather grow fuller than emptier,—the essential groundwork of our efficiency will not be altered. There is nothing new, the Scripture says, under the sun. The word of God is not astonisht by any of the things which have happened, and are daily happening. Very simple truths, which we have long misheard, will now, without our having any cause for onesided complaints, or for merely desiring the restoration of times gone by, be confirmed and illustrated by these events, and will be received as they never were before, in those tempers of mind which they have produced. The mischievous cupidity of selfishness, under the name of zeal for the public, has almost deprived us of that oath-hallowed inviolable centre, which must needs exist and be acknowledged, if a large mass are to act together for a great end, and to have a secure starting-point and goal. It has almost deprived us of the religion of social love. For this we have all to do penance, even such as may be able to trace the course of that spirit of errour, to which the Lord has given us up. We must point more than ever to that common enemy, who has not flesh and blood; and we must teach those who are called to the Kingdom of God, to put on and wield their true civic arms. For certain though it is that Providence will again shape this chaos into order, yet the work will still fail time after time in our hands, unless we seek in the fear of the Lord for the beginning of that wisdom, which looses and binds, which clears away and builds up. During this season of penitence and of the Passion, the tone of which must still predominate for a long time in our Sunday exercises, we may employ this evil time for unspeakable blessings; and they who proclaim the old and the new commandment, may go before all in that action and suffering which are requisite for carrying them into effect."

I know not how I can close these Notes more appropriately than

with the conclusion of Dorner's admirable Pamphlet. After unfolding his plan for the convocation of a general Synod of the German Evangelical Church, in such a manner as might be consistent with the establisht forms of their Ecclesiastical Law, with a view to the consolidation of the various Provincial Churches, whether holding the Lutheran or the Reformed Confession, into a United German Church, he says: "If this plan, which would secure the rights of evangelical freedom in a legal manner, with a faithful adherence to that which is already establisht, cannot be adopted, or if there be an unwillingness to follow it, then, for the moment, I see nothing else than the necessity of our acting for ourselves, with all the dangers, though transient ones, of anarchy and confusion. But I do not fear this. On the contrary I hope in God that our German princes, especially the Evangelical ones, will know how to act greatly in this great and solemn time in which we live. The ancestors of many of these princes took a glorious part in the Reformation in the sixteenth century. The illustrious descendants of these ancestors will be in their stead, when we are carrying out the second act of the Reformation, the Constitution of the United Evangelical Church. And as their noble ancestors did not ask, what shall we gain by affording protection and help to the Gospel? but, in a pure, princely spirit, did what was good and right, so their sons will not ask, what increase of power and dignity shall we obtain if we help in establishing the independence of the Evangelical Church, and in building up a United Evangelical German National Church? but will seek and find their reward in this good and great work itself, and in the thanks of posterity, who will bless their names, and rank them with their glorious ancestors of the age of the Reformation, still living in the hearts and mouths of all men.

"Are such thoughts of too lofty a flight? Is the hope too bold, of having a German National Church faithful to the Gospel? O, I know well in what a glaring contrast to this the real condition of Evangelical Christianity in Germany stands, and that too, not so much by reason of her sufferings, as of her guilt. Nor will I take my place among those, who, hovering to and fro between

fear and levity, would turn away their eyes from this guilt to new visions of imaginary dignity and glory. But while I do not conceal the hard struggles from myself, which we shall at all events have to wage, and which, I believe, are near, yet I also know that out of that true mourning, which now especially beseems every Christian congregation or synod, new life and new joy may spring up, through Him who can heal our wounds and take away our sins. I hope that the hearts-blood of the humble and brave, the free and faithful Evangelical Church is still beating, through God's grace, in the veins of many. Therefore have I ventured to take up my word. The best of what I had to say has long been lying in many a faithful evangelical spirit, and has even been uttered in part years ago by better men than I am. It seemed necessary to me however, that it should now be uttered again, and in a more urgent tone, since our need has meanwhile become more urgent, and many a noble evangelical mind is in want of the consolation and encouragement arising from some distinct prospect of hope, as an object to be aimed at. Many too are raised above themselves by great times and enterprises, and are taught to think more magnanimously. On the hights a purer air breathes, free from that party turbulence which has almost brought our Church into an anarchy like that of the Corinthian. O that many would mount into this clearer region, leaving behind what comes from below, and entering with a pure spirit upon the sacred virgin ground of these hights, to devote themselves here to the work of this new time, for God's sake, as a service to God! May we all receive a consecration for this great new age, the baptism from above with the spirit of humility and of courage, of love and of knowledge! Then may the days perhaps come, when the Evangelical Church, looking back on her present hours of distress, will say, *Thou hast shewn me great and sore troubles; but thou hast quickened me again and brought me up from the depths of the earth. We went upon the sea, and saw the works of the Lord. He commanded and raised the stormy wind which lifted up the waves, so that we mounted up to the heaven, and went down again to the depths, and our soul was melted because of trouble. We reeled to and fro, and staggered like*

a drunken man, and were at our wit's end. But, when we cried to the Lord in our trouble, He brought us out of our distresses, and made the storm a calm, so that the waves were still. Then were we glad because they were quiet; and He brought us to our desired haven. Therefore will we praise the Lord for His goodness, and for His wonderful works to the children of men. We will exalt Him in the congregation of the people, and praise Him in the assembly of the elders.—

"But, whatever may be appointed for us, we believe in the Holy Ghost, who broods over the waters of chaos, in a holy Christian Church, and a Communion of Saints, which will maintain its visible existence upon earth in an evangelical form also, and in the German nation. We believe in the living Lord and King of the Church, Jesus Christ, who can still the waves; and in the Father who has promist to the Son that He shall reign till all enemies are put under His feet. So then may the Triune God establish thee, thou beloved Evangelical Church, as a whole, and in all thy members, inwardly and outwardly! May He help us to accomplish the second act of the Reformation, by constituting the general Evangelical Church, so that thou mayest continue in the unity of faith and the power of the Spirit, what thou oughtest to be, the vanguard of Christianity upon earth. Spread out thine arms toward all thy brethren, who seem to be faithless toward thee, if so be thou mayest even now win them in the battle of love. But continue to be thyself; continue true to thyself. Seek no show of unity without the substance, without the hereditary treasures of the Evangelical Church."

Dorner calls on his friends Nitzsch and Müller, to whom his Pamphlet is addrest, to say Amen to the prayer. Assuredly in England also there are hearts that will join fervently in that Amen.

LONDON :
Printed by S. & J. Bentley, Wilson, and Fley,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

B165B

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.
REC'D LD-URL
NOV 08 1985

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 000 022 339 6